The Churchman.

VOLUME XVII. No. 23. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 Tim. iii.—15. WHOLE NUMBER, 355.

PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETORS. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 7, 1847. AT NO. 12 JOHN STREET.

FAMILY HARMONY.

(Psalm cxxxiii.)

Oh sweet as vernal dews that fill
The closing bud on Zion's hill,
When evening clouds draw thither—
It is for human hearts to see
The members of one family
Live peacefully together.

The children like the lilly flowers,
On which descend the suns and showers,
Their hues of beauty blending—
The parents like the gopher boughs,
On which the foliage thickly grows,
Their friendly shade extending.

But leaves the greenest will decay,
And flowers the brightest pass away,
When autumn winds are sweeping;
And be the household e'er so fair,
The hand of death shall soon be there,
And turn the scene to weeping.

Yet leaves again will clothe the trees,
And lilies wave them in the breeze,
When spring comes smiling hither;
And friends that parted at the tomb,
Shall yet renew their loveliest bloom,
And meet in heaven together.

For the Churchman.

REVIEW OF THE TRIAL OF BISHOP ONDERDONK.

NUMBER ONE.

I have, I trust, presumed to enter upon this subject out of no spirit of reckless disregard of the authority of the Church, or of the proceedings of her properly constituted tribunals. But all will admit that the obligation of obedience to authority must have some limits. Few, I think, in the present day, will advocate the doctrine of absolute passive obedience—of mere blind subserviency to the decrees of courts, or councils. Certainly I should not expect such a doctrine to come from the stoutest champion of Protestantism. All men who admit the right of any considerable portion of Protestant Christendom to be considered an integral portion of the Church, *must* admit the right of resistance to the decrees of the regularly constituted tribunals of that portion of the Church with which we are, for the time, connected. Unless this be admitted, the principle of Protestantism itself is mere rebellion, and its continued, distinct, organized existence is, on the most favorable view, schismatic. I know there is a view by which the English Church claims to escape from this imputation, on the ground that the present national Church in that country is the regularly continued successor of the first Christian Church, established in that Island, by one of the Apostles perhaps; either St. Paul or St. James, I believe; and that the Roman Church adherents, in that island, were in fact the schismatics in that country. This view has always seemed, to me, to be a sound view of the history of the English Church, and of our own Church, as a valid branch of that portion of the one Holy, Catholic, Apostolical Church, referred to in our creeds. This is the view generally taken of the subject by the friends of Bishop Onderdonk; with many exceptions and important qualifications, no doubt. But that portion of our Church which has been most active in bringing about the trial of Bishop Onderdonk, and those who were principally instrumental in his condemnation, in the main, hold no such doctrine of the Church. They hold, generally I mean, to the right of private judgment, in such a sense, that any individual, or any body of men, may plant themselves upon *their own construction* of the Canon of Holy Scripture, or of *truth*, in doctrine or practice, and resist *all* the traditions of the Church, of however long standing, or uniform concurrence, and even the most solemn determination of the most ancient councils; and the RESULT BE SETTLED BY ARGUMENT ALONE, if the time ever comes when *any thing* can be *settled* in that way. This is the basis upon which all the Protestant denominations in this country, and in Europe, must rest, unless the English Church be an exception. Upon this view of the subject, then, no determination of any matter, by any authority in the Church, is of any validity, except so far forth, as that determination is *just* and *right*. The *final appeal*, in all such cases, is to the sovereign arbitrament of *public opinion*. Such seems to have been *the view of a majority of the Court of Bishops* in publishing the Trial of Bishop Onderdonk. And upon that view of the subject, it is just, and proper, that the trial should be reviewed by all who choose.

But this is not the ground upon which I choose to put my own determination of attempting to expose the *severity* and *injustice* of that Trial, and the lameness of the ground upon which the judgment rests. In the first place, I have not the least manner of doubt that the whole matter of this trial was got up on account of what grew out of the ordination of the late lamented Arthur Carey. That there has been, from the very first, an *under current* in this effort—a *disguised object in view*; that it has been begun, and consummated, in a spirit of *indirection*, I most solemnly believe.—From the very first, I expected that Bishop Onderdonk's defiance of the clamor attempted to be raised against him on that occasion, and his firm, unwavering adherence to the truly Catholic character of our Church, in regard to that matter, would in some way, unless averted by the hand of a wise Providence, be made to recoil upon its innocent author. Had he pursued the *temporising, vacillating* course which his oppugners desired, and *shielded* himself by abusing Mr. Carey, as they would have done, Bishop Onderdonk would now have been, with that portion of the Church, the most popular Bishop in all the House of Bishops. But because he *could* not do that, he must be hunted, like a stricken deer, from the countenance of man, until he perish from the remembrance of the earth. And, in all this, these men never once stop to question the perfect purity of their own purposes. They *believe* that the earth belongs to the saints, and that themselves are the saints, in no abstract or collective signification, but *personally* and *individually*. They glory in the result of their persecution, and herald it to the world, as confirmation strong, as proof from Holy Writ, that Almighty God smiles upon the justice of their course; forgetting, it seems to me, that He causeth His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. In confirmation of this view, I need only allude to *the time* when this prosecution was brought forward. After an entire failure, a complete *route*, of all the efforts of that *clique*, both in the New-York Convention and in the General Convention, and when, by such failure, Bishop Onderdonk's course had finally been virtually approved, one last, desperate effort was made, and the offending member cut off, by the very acts of some who had openly arraigned and denounced his conduct in the ordination of Mr. Carey. If any further proof were still needed, to show that this was the real motive for presenting Bishop Onderdonk, it may be found in the staleness of the charges brought against him. Not one of them dating nearer than two and a half years of the time of the trial, and many of them extending much farther back—to three, four, and even six and seven years. Under these wrongs, whatever they were, all the parties concerned had quietly rested, without, in any more than a single instance, ever naming it to the Bishop, or giving him the least intimation, by word or look, that they harbored the least unkindness towards him; until when summoned forth, *at the call of the opposers of the ordination of Mr. Carey, they* felt the awkwardness of their position, and one them, (Rev. Mr. Butler,) declared, that "*the proper time*" for bringing these matters forward "*had been suffered to pass.*" Truly, one would think so. That modest, chaste women would submit to such indignities, and make no complaint, for seven years, and then come forward to obtain redress *for their own injuries*, or *those of the Church*, suffered through them!

2. In the next place, I feel justified in reviewing this trial, and, if need be, in resisting the judgment, because it was rendered *without law*, and *against law*. The law under which that trial was held was, strictly and technically, *ex post facto*. It was *retrospective* and *retroactive*, not only in the sense of regulating the *mode of trial*, which might legally be done perhaps, but it was *ex post facto*, in the sense prohibited in the United States Constitution, in that it *defined* an offence, and *affixed a penalty*, in a case where no penalty existed before; and all this after the alleged offence was committed. For the former Canon, which was repealed, without reserve of penalties actually incurred, was wholly a *void Canon*, in its best estate. It *affixed no penalty*, and *defined no judgment*, which the court, on conviction, *could render*. Bishop Onderdonk was therefore tried under a law which did not exist when the alleged offence was committed, and indeed for an alleged offence committed when no *law existed*. He was therefore tried and condemned *without law*. Is it unreasonable, then, that his friends should still claim to argue his innocence? Have they not the right to argue against such a trial—against the effects of such a judgment? Such trial is of no more validity, such a judgment no more deserves respect, than if it had been rendered without notice to the accused, or by any merely self-constituted tribunal; e. g. the Superior Court of the City of New-York, or the Vestry of Trinity Church; either of which courts, if they had had jurisdiction of the case, might, doubtless, have tried it with impartiality and justice, and with sufficient ability. It seems to me that these two considerations, and one more, which I will name presently, should have induced the Presenters and the court to hesitate.

3. The third consideration, to which I alluded, is, that the Canon under which the Bishop was tried seems so framed as to imply that *three Bishops* will *be called to act* as the presenters of a Bishop *only* when his convention *unjustly* refuse to present him. The foreign Bishops then, coming forward at this time, did imply a *censure* upon the majority of the Convention, of the largest diocese in the American Church. Now what was the real extent of the censure intended? Not, I take it, that a majority of the diocese were prepared to *justify any and every degree of impurity or immorality* in their Bishop. I do not suppose the movers against Bishop Onderdonk seriously *believed* the majority of the Convention of the New-York diocese any more wanting in morality, or a respect for morals, or any more inclined to connive at immorality in others, or in their Bishop even, than themselves, generally speaking; but they knew that a majority of the Convention justified Bishop Onderdonk's course, in regard to the ordination of Mr. Carey, and they did not expect any one, who justified his course in that particular, to come forward and present him for charges which had been buried for years in the filth of their own slime, and the forgetfulness to which such oppressive objects are, by common consent, so justly consigned, for the indirect purpose which they had at heart; especially when, in addition to the natural offensiveness of the charges thus dug up from their quiet slumber of years, they have the further trait of having been foolish in their inception, and almost ludicrous in the quiet acquiescence with which they are claimed to have been submitted to by the patient sufferers. The presenters could therefore hardly be considered as less than officious intermeddlers themselves in bringing the matter forward at this time, unless it had been to accomplish the much denied end of getting rid of an unflinching adherent to Catholic truth and Catholic practice.

4. I have a few words more to say, in regard to the peculiar circumstances attending the *presentment* of Bishop Onderdonk. The unusual secrecy, and ominous "*reserve*," practised in the matter, towards the accused, was, to my mind, suspicious, and indicative of a foregone conclusion that this last resort must not be thwarted, or in any manner permitted to fall through. If the object had been simple justice, where there was so much, to throw suspicion upon the case, presented to the accusing Bishops, one would suppose that there would have been a desire to ascertain whether the charges, which had slumbered so long as to already smell of staleness, (not to use a more offensive term,) were not susceptible of satisfactory explanation. But no; every hint of the goings on of the matter was studiously kept from the Bishop, and his friends, until the train was laid, the fatal pit fully prepared; and then, by way of keeping a promise to the ear, but breaking it to the hope, a copy of the charges was furnished the Bishop, as if in very mockery of all that frankness and fair dealing which, among Christian brethren, might have been looked for.

5. It seems strange to me that three men, of such wisdom and experience as the Presenters confessedly were, should have seen nothing in their position, at the time, calling for delicacy of feeling on their part, and some little delay of action, to say the least. They saw this movement got up, and carried forward, against the Bishop of New-York by a very few persons, and those, not the parties professedly aggrieved by the offences complained of, or their friends, they all the while showing extreme reluctance to move, but carried forward by a few who were known to have been more or less offended, and some of them deeply stung, by official acts of the accused no way connected with the charges preferred. In addition to this, every one who was moving in this matter was confessedly either writhing under some bitter personal grudge towards Bishop Onderdonk, or else deeply hostile to him on account of his different views of Church doctrine and discipline from those which they esteemed sound and wholesome. And all this time the entire diocese of New-York, with the exception of an inconsiderable minority, who held different views of the Church, were fully satisfied with their Bishop, in all respects. Under this state of facts, it is not a little remarkable that these three Bishops, who professed the very antagonist views of their brother of New-York, should not have felt that for them to come forward as his accusers would give occasion to his friends to feel that they were influenced in their own feelings, or instigated by others, more from a disposition to give the ascendancy to their own party in the Church, than by any pure, disinterested sorrow for the weakness of a fellow minister of their holy religion. And being placed in such straits, men who felt anxious to avoid the *appearance* of evil, it would seem, would have hesitated, would have delayed long, before coming forward. But instead of that, the Presenters of Bishop Onderdonk went forward, in hot haste, as if fearful of being anticipated in the race for glory, the championship of the orthodoxy of the Church, under the fine guise of contending for the inviolability of the character and persons of "christian ladies," and the spotlessness of the character and *secret purposes of the heart of all those* who serve at the altars of our holy faith!! It does seem to me that the witnesses, whether from an affectation of delicacy, in order to salve over their long silence under insult, which if bona fide received, to the extent sworn to in the *ex parte* affidavits upon which the Presentment was based, no person, of the least delicacy, would suffer to remain in silence for an hour, or from a consciousness that they were acting as the dupes of others who cared not one whit for *their wrongs*, or the *purity* of the Church, is not for me to say; but certain it does seem, they exhibited a more becoming spirit of reserve than did the Presenters. Much more might be said upon this head. But enough has been said, I trust, to justify the opinion, which is pretty generally entertained among dispassionate men of all parties, that had it not been for the ordination of Arthur Carey, and the overpowering energy with which the Bishop of New-York put down an attack made upon himself in the N. Y. Convention, this Presentment would never have been heard of. From that moment the decree went forth that Bishop Onderdonk was a tyrant, and must be put down, right or wrong. And in this feeling all the Protestant sects of course sympathised, for many reasons, and the scoffing world also. Hence the Presenters had a public opinion ready made to their hands, and one not likely to fail them if they used it discreetly. This they did, in attempting the ruin of their victim by indirection—in appealing still further to the prejudices of the popular feeling, by charging a Christian Bishop with "impurity," and heralding the insults and wrongs of "worthy christian ladies." But next in order of the drama comes the trial. I think enough has been shown to justify us in calling it a *drama*.

This was indeed a very imposing affair, got up with great pomp and circumstance, and minute ceremony. But not to dwell upon its pageantry and imposing awe, like an inquisitorial judgment, *auto de fe*, the *mere form* of a hearing, to *give color*, to a predetermined judgment, (if this was not its design and character, in addition to the circumstances, which have been already named, in regard to the Presenters, many of which equally apply to the case of the Triers,) I will name some few others, which seem singular, to those who spend their whole lives in the going forward of trials in courts of justice, both civil and criminal.

1. And, to my mind, the most astonishing feature in this whole proceeding was the part which three of the court, who had publicly and formally charged Bishop Onderdonk with heresy and violation of his ordination vows in regard to the case of Rev. Mr. Carey, were allowed to take, and did take, in the trial. The least proper sense of delicacy would, one would suppose, have induced men, so circumstanced, not voluntarily to come forward to act as the judges in the case of one against whom they had publicly entered the lists as an opposer, accuser, and calumniator even, unless he were verily guilty of the matters charged by them. Into these matters, which were the head and front of his offending, he had formally challenged an inquiry. Why, then, was he not presented for the offence of heresy? If he had been, would either of these, his accusers, have presumed to sit as one of his judges? But did they not know, does not every one know, that this trial was brought about wholly on account of the offence taken at his proceedings in regard to Mr. Carey's ordination? Did they not see just the same division of parties in the Church, with few exceptions, upon the one question as the other? Why then should those who had assumed so antagonistic an attitude, sit as his triers? And if so, common delicacy would have dictated, it would seem, that they should have taken no very active or forward part in the trial. But, what was the fact? Upon the shoulders of these three men rested the active burden of the trial and conviction. It is not too much, to say that without their presence, either Bishop Onderdonk would have been acquitted, or would only have been sentenced to some slight admonition, which would have been esteemed a *failure* by the prosecutors. Such a thing could never have happened in a civil tribunal, in a free country. The trial of Bishop Onderdonk, in that respect, more resembles the proceedings of a court of inquisitors, or of star chamber, than anything known in modern times. That a man should be tried for charges affecting his character to the last degree, and his very existence, as a Christian Bishop, and should have no right of challenge in regard to his triers, either for cause or without cause, and that upon his trial men should presume to sit whose feelings and character were literally staked upon the issue of the trial—is painful to remember—it is awful to reflect upon. That I do not say too much upon this subject, I appeal to the official report of the trial, for the part these men took in the trial. Each of them watchful, eagle-eyed, during the whole course of that protracted sitting, almost always in their places, the first to interrogate the witnesses, whenever the sagacity of the Presenters, or their counsel, were at fault; and *such* questions, to come from a Judge!! Not one of them which exhibited the most remote interest in eliciting a single fact which might, by possibility, *exculpate* their aged brother, then before them, in sorrow, pain and affliction, borne down with increasing age and increasing calamities; but, at every point, watchful to elicit facts, or suspicions, unfavorable to the accused; reaching and scenting, even, after some slight innuendo, if nothing more could be had, even the unfavorable construction of the witnesses, to help to stay up a tottering fabric; and actually bringing in a verdict (e. g. two of the three) of guilty upon one of the charges, which was flatly disproved by the only witness relied upon, or that was in fact to be relied upon, in the matter, and in regard to which *every other member of the court rendered a verdict of acquittal;* and then that verdict coming from these *two Bishops* in such coincidence of language as evidently to show that the coincidence could not have been accidental, that they must have consulted together apart from other members of the court, in regard to it. If such a thing had happened in a civil tribunal of the United States, it would have excited a burst of indignation that would have shaken this republic from one end to the other, and would have been far more worthy of a vote of impeachment than that against Judge Chase, or Judge Peck, both of which were voted in the House of Representatives by strictly party votes indeed, but both of which failed of their final consummation in the Senate, in consequence of the Constitution requiring a two-thirds vote for conviction upon an impeachment for official corruption; and also that there were *some men* in *that* honorable body whose *love of truth and justice* rose superior to their *love of party*, and who, to their eternal credit, refused to do the bidding of their leaders, when the honor and the very existence of the character of a persecuted political rival was at stake. Had either of these safeguards existed in the case of Bishop Onderdonk, he would have escaped the furnace which his persecutors had heated for him, and into which he was so relentlessly hurled by his implacable rivals, oppugners, and judges. And yet nothing in the history of all the secular tribunals in this country bears the slightest analogy to this court of Bishops, unless it be our Senate, sitting as a court of impeachment, or a similar court under the State constitutions. These impeachments, too, are always instigated and carried forward by party rancour, but have thus far failed of ruining their victims, by the causes which I have named. But in a Christian court of Bishops no such escape is found. Oh shame! where is thy blush!

July, 1847. R. F. I.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—Certain "proposed alterations of the Constitution" of this Diocese, printed on page 49 of the Journal of the last Convention, are certainly deserving of serious consideration. As they have not yet been "approved of" in any Convention, they have still to be favorably acted on by two Conventions, and cannot therefore be adopted until 1848. As, however, the discussions and action of the approaching Convention, should it think proper to take them up, may have influence on the next, it may be reasonable to glance at their merits. They embrace the points of lay membership, and clerical membership, in our Diocesan Conventions.

Under the first head is included the grave question, whether lay membership shall be restricted by law to communicants; and this, like a large class of practical questions, divides itself into the two heads of what is *desirable and proper*, and what it is *expedient and best to enforce by law*.

Certainly common sense suggests, that they are the most suitable persons to take an active interest, and to be invested with important trusts, in the affairs of the Church, who give practical evidence, in their conduct, of faithful allegiance to that religion which it is the great object of the Church to maintain and enforce. Defective moral principle must be a serious disqualification for promoting social interests, and fulfilling virtuous trusts, of any kind. Obedience to the divine law is an essential principle of morals, without which no system, and no character, can justly claim to be strictly moral. Doubt of habitual and faithful participation of the Lord's Supper being a requirement of the divine law—a point so clearly and strongly set forth by the Church—is totally inconsistent with that confidence in the Church, respect for her, and allegiance to her, without which no man can be safely trusted with important departments of her interests. To admit the truth of the Church's doctrine, and consequently the binding obligation of her appointments and requisitions, herein, and yet to refuse or neglect obedience to these, is to manifest a spirit of insubordination, and at least *indifference* to law, which ought certainly to disqualify for making laws, or providing for their execution. Is there not palpable absurdity, to say the best of it, in men busying themselves in matters pertaining to the regulation and government of the Church, who yet live in habitual neglect and violation of the Church's laws? Is not a much more serious character attached to this, when those laws are but an enforcement of the most sacred and binding laws of Christ Himself? Apply the principle to civil concerns: What good citizen would think it safe and right to entrust a man with the responsibilities and duties of a legislator, who is openly and notoriously a violator of the laws of the commonwealth?

The infusion into the Church of a secular spirit, is a sore evil, threatening great injury to the cause of the Gospel. It is an evil, however, to which the outward system of ecclesiastical operations is constantly exposed. The introduction into these operations of duly tested and approved principles and measures of civil polity, is indeed highly useful, and sometimes, to a certain extent, necessary. When men meet, especially in considerable numbers, for deliberation and action, whether the objects be sacred or secular, and when desirable ends of either class are to be accomplished through combined human agencies, it is undoubtedly true, that well ordered and efficient action can be best secured by paying due regard to such rules and measures of operation as have been developed and favorably tested by the judgment and experience of wise and good men. And as the interests of the life that now is, have, in fact, generally enlisted the largest share of men's consideration and attention, it is in the secular line that wholesome practical rules and precedents are mainly to be found. Hence an undoubted advantage of having in our ecclesiastical deliberative and legislative bodies, men whose secular studies and experience entitle them to deference in such matters.

Still, however, there is a serious danger connected with this subject. This world is a wicked world. Attention to its concerns, without an habitually cherished strong influence of religious principles, motives, and ends, rarely fails to be mingled with such as are decidedly adverse to the Christian profession; and which, therefore, brought to bear on the business of the Church, must either give it a wrong direction and operation, or seriously counterbalance with evil any present and partial benefit. This danger is by none seen more clearly, and acknowledged more frankly and feelingly, than by intelligent laymen, who sincerely love the Church, whose minds are well supplied with the knowledge, and whose hearts are warmed with the affections, proper to the character of pious and enlightened Christians. It is of course beneath the present object to pay any regard to the low jealousies in this matter which may be attempted to be stirred up by, or in behalf of, persons of a different description. It may, however, be said here, once for all, that the system adopted in our branch of the Church, of giving *separate votes* to the clerical and lay orders, requiring their *joint consent* to proposed measures, is an effectual barrier against encroachments by either order on the rights of the other, and therefore a conclusive answer to the contemptible and wicked efforts, so often put forth, to stir up invidious feelings between them. I am decidedly favorable to the admission of laity into our Conventions, as right in both principle and policy.

The evils threatened by a want of proper care in the selection of lay delegates to our Conventions, are various. They arise, in part, from the laity, as a body, being so little accustomed to give the study and reflection necessary to a just view of ecclesiastical subjects, especially in the connection which these, often very nearly, and generally more or less, have with points of Christian doctrine and duty. This may be, to a certain extent, unavoidable in men whose states of life require much attention to the duties of secular callings. I apprehend, however, that if there were a proper appropriation of the intervals of the Lord's day not required for the services of the Church, and a reasonable curtailment, on other days, of engagements and reading, not connected with the demands of duty or necessity—in other words, if there was prevalent an earnest and honest desire to become well informed Christians and Churchmen—we should have a laity much better prepared to entertain and discuss religious and ecclesiastical questions. And when intelligent laymen, with minds strengthened by study, informed by experimental knowledge of the world, guided by the experience of the human character which secular occupation affords, and brought under the control of the faith and piety of the Gospel, give their powers to the fair and unprejudiced investigation of such questions, we see those who justly draw to themselves the reverence and confidence of the good, who are true friends and valuable aids to the pastors of the Church, and whose counsels in ecclesiastical matters illustrate the excellence and blessedness of the system which, in the first and purest days of the Church, enlisted brethren, as well as apostles and elders, in her concerns. Next to these in claims to respect, are the many laity among us, in whose sound judgments and pure principles, coupled with religious and moral characters of the most exemplary kind, the highest confidence may be placed, who, being thus situated, have the good sense to know, the modesty to feel, and the honesty to confess, that they have wanted proper time or opportunity to make themselves masters of many questions which come up in ecclesiastical bodies, and therefore will either not meddle with them, or will approach them with a deference and modesty, a desire to learn, and a willingness to be taught, which set an example, creditable to their understandings, consistent with their Christian profession, and sadly needed by many, of not half their sense and worth, who yet fear not to approach any and every subject, with the boldness which ignorance never fails to strengthen. These last constitute a class, having various sections, which has brought much disrepute upon, and exposed the Church to much evil from, the department of our ecclesiastical system now considered. They have exposed us to the charge of having in our councils, unbaptized men; mere politicians, devoted to self-aggrandizement, and little heedful how or in what department they do it, so they but gain influence and power; those whose characters are almost exclusively moulded by studies and efforts to bring about ends by adroit application of means far more characterized by worldly cunning than religious or moral scrupulousness; men making no pretension to spiritual views, who yet range themselves with ecclesiastical parties, and ply, in behalf of party ends, tactics which never knew what it was to take the Gospel for their rule and measure; men to whom their pastors can never point as examples of constancy and devotion in the temple and at the altar; men more at home in the saloons of worldly mirth, in the theatre and the opera-house, at the gaming table, or on the turf, than in God's temple; men of profane speech, and whose known characters and habits entirely screen from uncharitableness the fear that a position of supposed interest in religion and morals is assumed by them as a cover for their own delinquencies, or a means of diverting into a deceptive channel whatever observation they may draw upon themselves.

The evils of the system of lay representation in ecclesiastical councils, which have now been noticed, it must be obvious to every reflecting mind, are those to which it is really exposed. Would I could stop here; and that it were not also true that virtuous and good men have had too much cause to lament that these evils *have been felt!*

By your good leave, Mr. Editor, and the permission of Divine Providence, I will ask space for another article embracing the general point of the remedy of such evils, and the particular question whether it should be required by law that all lay delegates be communicants.

N. Y.

For the Churchman.

THE PAST AND THE PRESENT.

NUMBER TWO.

Dear Mr. Editor,—The question raised in our last is one of fundamental importance, and must be discussed, or its solution taken for granted, in every effort to account for and remedy the evils of any existing state of society, viz., "Is Christianity a *permanent* system, objectively existing, to form and mould the character of the man and the age, and to which therefore we must submit and conform *nolens volens*,—or is it a transient phasis of society, now about to give place to another?" Mr. Carlyle and Theodore Parker have professedly taken the latter view, and a good many others seem to have taken it without professing it, or even being conscious that they have done so.

This is a question which we may have to discuss by and bye in due form; for the Romanist, in his theory of Development, has adopted this view no less really and practically, than Carlyle, Emerson, Parker, and the host like them both in our country and in Europe. But I shall not discuss the question here. For myself and for your readers, I shall assume the solution to be in favor of the permanency of Christianity as a system of permanent, positive obligation, which God will enforce by the dispensations and chastisements of His providence. For myself and for them, I shall consider the command, to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," and *as* it was delivered to them, as being as obligatory as any one of the ten in the Decalogue.—With this view let us look into "*the Present*" as contrasted with "*the Past*," and say if we cannot find other causes, and propose other remedies for the evils of "*the Present*," unknown to "*the Past*," than those which have suggested themselves to Mr. Carlyle.

As I understand the matter, Christianity was designed to conquer the world, and not the world it. Whether it will ever succeed in this contest may be matter of doubt, but is in reality entirely a different and distinct consideration. With this, and with nothing less than this, may it be content. It may never give over the contest and confess itself vanquished, however appearances may seem to indicate such a result to have actually occurred.

But neither Christianity nor the world is a mere formless abstraction. They meet in concrete embodiments, in collisions more or less fierce, and often long continued. It is not merely the soul, hitherto wedded to the world, struggling now for a while with what he finds written for him or against him in his Bible, as he pursues the subject in the privacy of his own thoughts: No: it is Convocation against Parliament—Bishop against his Convention—Parish Priest against his vestry and his congregation—the Church against the popular opinion; contending and struggling whether this Scripture doctrine shall be preached—this primitive usage observed—this rule of godly discipline enforced; or whether these things shall give place to the more fashionable, the more popular, the more easy substitute of modern times.

The world, as I said, is not a mere abstraction; nor yet is it a mere vague, unorganized, indefinite mass. Its concentrated force meets you in the shape of wealth, demagogueism, and political power. The men who possess these things are its chosen Captain Generals, under whom its whole forces are marshalled in battle array, and fight with desperate energy.

Nor is Christianity a mere abstraction—a system of doctrines and principles which a man may take up or lay down and leave unharmed at his pleasure. For all the purposes now before our minds it stands concentrated in the Bishop or the Priest, who in honest fidelity and well informed discretion, strives to do the duties of his holy office—and with him it stands or falls in this contest.

Now in England, Christianity, or the Church, which is the visible embodiment of Christianity, (and by the Church I mean not the aggregation of its members but the Divine Institution,) is completely subjected to the king and parliament, which are the visible and effective embodiment of the world. Without the king's consent it cannot meet in Convocation or Synod, and when met can act upon no business whatever without his permission first obtained; and its acts, when once passed, are of no validity until they have received the sanction of king and parliament. No vacant See can be filled—no people can be supplied with a chief pastor under Christ—until the king shall be pleased to name the person; and the person so named—the royal favorite—under pain of a variety of penalties, must be elected, consecrated, and inducted to the holy office in the Church of God. If a lay patron should nominate to a vacant parish, a man acceptable to himself chiefly by his *un*worthiness for the office to which he is promoted, the ecclesiastic who should refuse to do what belonged to his part in giving the unworthy favorite of the lay proprietor the spiritual charge of the flock, would find himself overwhelmed in a *quare impediat*. Even the exercise of Discipline is paralyzed. A Bishop may spend his Sundays in fox hunting and gambling, and deny seven out of the twelve articles of the Christian Faith—a priest may spend his time and the money which he receives as from the Lord, that he may serve in His temple, in a foreign country in rioting in drunkenness and debauchery, and yet be beyond the reach of discipline—protected by the ample shield of political power. Such men *the world* may promote and sustain in the places that should be filled by holy men, fearing God—sound in the faith, blameless in life, diligent in season and out of season, doing the work of the Lord. So far, and even farther than this, has England subjected Christianity to the world. It tolerates Christianity in so much and so far as it pleases to allow it to go—that which should teach and guide and govern, is bound hand and foot, and permitted to live on the crumbs that fall from the table. The king or queen, having the sovereign authority, must, it is true, be a member of the Church; but he may be an open infidel, a papist, or a dissenter at heart, live in adultery, drunkenness, and gluttony—and the parliament is composed of as many Churchmen as they can elect, and the rest are infidels, papists, dissenters, radicals, rascals, and whatever else can manage to get itself elected. Such is the power that has chief control of the spiritual affairs in England! Is it a matter of wonder that there is "almost no religion extant?"

It is certainly much easier to say that this is *not* the relation that should subsist between Church and State, Christianity and the world, than to say what that relation should be.

If we look into "*the Past*," I find only one instance of such a relation as met the entire approbation of the whole Church Catholic.

Constantine, while Emperor of the world, was *converted to* Christianity. This fact lay at the bottom of his heart, and reached to the uppermost prominence in his thoughts ever afterwards. *He made no effort to convert Christianity to himself*. He recognized it as his teacher, his guide, his governor. As an individual he performed the duties which it requires of all men. As one having authority, he used that authority to secure obedience among his people to God's laws *in all things concerning which God had spoken, either directly in His holy Word, or by those to whom He promised*—"Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven; and wheresoever two or three are gathered together there am I in the midst of them." He did not presume to put his will or judgment in the place of Christianity. He made no effort to legislate for the Church. But he felt himself responsible to the full extent of the authority that God had given him for the believing all the articles of the Christian faith—for the observance of every law of God (as he found them in the Church, and as the Church represented them to him,) among the people of his vast empire.

This presents a question well worthy of the consideration of "kings and all that are in authority," whether in very truth, we—in case all things go as they ought—are converted to Christianity or Christianity is converted to us. The difference is very material. It seems to me that popes, kings, princes and nobles, loquacious lawyers, and rich pew-owners and purse-proud wardens and vestrymen, have decided in favor of the latter alternative.

But to my mind the truth seems far otherwise, and that Christianity, in its "visible embodiment," the Church, and in its active living agents, the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, is here for the very purpose of converting us *from our* evil ways, opinions and likings, *to* the ways, truths, and likings of the Lord, and to instruct and to guide and to govern—yes, *govern*, for the word will out—to govern us, and that they must do so, and we must submit to have them do so in *their* discretion—we, whether "kings," "all that are in authority," or the humblest of the humble poor—laying aside our wills and wishes, our opinions and ways, that so we may be conformed to the image of Christ.

There can be no doubt of the fact. Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are here, by the Divine appointment, for the very purpose of teaching, guiding, and governing us—training us up for the Lord in heaven—so many of us as will submit ourselves to be taught, guided, governed and trained by them. To submit them to our guidance and goverance, whether we be kings, princes, rich men or low—yes, whatever embodiment of a world we may be, is an utter subversion and changing about of the whole matter.

To my mind the law of God in this matter stands written in the 60th chapter of Isaiah, verse 12th, "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve Thee [Christ] shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." Mark the word, it is "*serve*," not "*command*," or "*let alone*," but SERVE, SERVE—you can make nothing else of it.

Now, as things are, there is no way in which

you can *serve* the Lord, except by believing on Him and obeying Him, according as they whom He has appointed in His ministry of the Apostolic Succession, shall teach, exhort, and admonish you. It is not as a nation or a kingdom that we serve him, when the majority even (if so fortunate a thing should happen, which is not likely,) are true, humble, and sincere Christians. It is as a nation—with authority which it as a nation or kingdom possesses—with its head, whether emperor, king, or president, with "all in authority" under him, use their authority to enforce his faith and laws as His appointed guides and teachers represent the same. It is not Maynooth grants—toleration for all denominations, or vested rights of religious and charitable corporations, that discharges the full extent of their obligation; the authority which He has given must be used in the ways that are most expedient, most conducive to the end, for the enforcement of His laws.

Religion and politics are not the same thing; far from it. Bishops and kings, *as such*, have but little or nothing to do or say about corn-law or fur trade measures, regulating the military forces, and such things. But they have a right to say what is the true worship of God, and to provide one for the people to use. They have a right to say what are His laws and how the people can best walk in them. And the nation or the kingdom that would "serve Him" must provide for the offering of that worship, and command the observance of those laws. They cannot serve Him by promoting schism, encouraging heresy, or leaving people with their approbation, or at least without their censure, to riot in open infidelity, erect the standard of antichrist in their midst by establishing a religion and church of their own in opposition to His.

This has been sound doctrine in "*the Past*," though I am aware that it will seem strange to many in "*the Present*." But notwithstanding the diffusion of knowledge among the people, the enlightenment of the age, and the capacity of every man to judge for himself, people have not yet attained quite to that degree of omniscience, that whatever seems new to them, or whatever had not occurred to their thoughts before, is therefore necessarily false—the fresh coin of some bewildered brain.

Mr. Editor, I trust and hope that I am a Christian, not by the conversion of Christianity to me, but by the conversion of myself to Christianity. With me the Church is no mere theory. It is my mother, my teacher, my guide, my governor. And because I cannot go into the house of God, there to offer the sacrifice of thanksgiving and praise which she has provided for me daily morning and evening, I collect my family around me morning and evening, and offer it there, and feel that I am making to God an *acceptable* offering—the *lamb* which He requires, and not a *pig* or a *wolf* of my own choosing or fancying. But Oh! if I could only go into the closet and meet the Lord there, and hear the declaration of the Absolution of my sins from one to whom He hath given "power and commandment" to declare it; how cheerfully could I work through the day! how sweetly sleep at night! "It would take time," say my neighbors. So it would; but I know not how time could be spent better.

I also feel that the little authority which God has given me as the head of a family must be used in persuading, urging, nay, compelling every member of my family to serve Him—not as they may choose—Christ has not called us to choose for ourselves what we will believe and do, but to take up our cross, deny ourselves, and believe and do what He chooses to have us—but as His appointed Ambassadors have taught and commanded to be most in accordance with His will who is their Master. If I were a rich man or a lawyer, I should use my wealth to support the Church, and my tongue and talents to defend and uphold it,—and then let the Church teach, guide, and govern me in her discretion in perfect confidence, that he whom Christ has appointed to guide and govern me, cannot lead me where Christ himself will not find and acknowledge me to be His. If I were king and prince I do not see how the main principles of the matter could be changed. I certainly would not burn heretics at the stake, or put schismatics to the sword. But I would give them no encouragement or countenance. I would treat them as offenders against God, who needed correction, and should feel that my authority was given me, in part, for that very purpose. Oh! I fear there must be strange overturnings of nations, empires, and kingdoms, before peace shall come like a river and righteousness like an overflowing stream. But when the teacher is put into the place of the taught—when the guide is compelled to follow, and the governor subjected to control of those he should govern, there comes a multitude of evils which no moral reforms or legislative enactments can remedy.

CONTRIBUTOR.

For the Churchman.

Dear Sir.—In my last communication, I observed that if the reasons of the majority of the court of Bishops had been sound and conclusive, in favor of the verdict they gave, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to shake the effect of their decision. We are not left to conjecture in this matter. The reasons are spread on the record, and we are at liberty to go to that record, and find out what they are. I may be very much mistaken, but I think we shall find some of the strangest specimens of legal knowledge and judicial logic, that are any where to be found. Of course I do not impeach the sincerity of the authors of these opinions, I give them all the respect to which they are entitled. Still, when we think that a brother Bishop has been by them condemned to a most severe and degrading punishment on these grounds, we have a right to examine them, and see if they are well founded in law and reason.

I pass over the opinion of Bishop Chase, of Illinois, with the simple remark, that after having read it, I fully agree with Mr. Cooper, (if he did mean this prelate,) that he should never have sat upon the trial. Here is abundant proof to every doubter of the proposition.

The Bishop of Connecticut comes next in order. The high respectability and presumed impartiality of this prelate must give great weight to his opinions. I trusted to find good law and logic combined in that document, however unwilling I might be to admit his conclusions. It was therefore with great astonishment I found the following words:

"The second Article charges the Respondent with having been, on a certain occasion, "improperly excited by vinous or spirituous liquors." The facts sworn to on this specification are of an equivocal character, and the opinions of Mr. and Mrs. Butler are not conclusive evidence to my mind. But as the facts charged have been fully admitted by both the counsel of the Respondent, I have been obliged to consider him as guilty." P. 263.

And again, p. 264:

"The facts stated in the first Article of the Presentment, though most remote in date, are nearly allied to those considered in the 7th and 8th articles, being indicative of the same state or habit of mind in the Respondent. They are proved by the positive testimony of Mrs. Butler, which is corroborated by the testimony (direct and indirect) of her husband. They are circumstantially supported by the facts proved under the 7th and 8th specifications, and they have been *virtually admitted as true by both the counsel of the Respondent, who plead his excitement by vinous or spirituous liquors, in extenuation of the offences alleged against him.* I am therefore bound to consider him guilty of the facts charged in this article."

It will thus be perceived that the Bishop of Connecticut finds his verdict of guilty on the *second* count principally, upon the supposed fact that "the facts charged have been fully admitted by both the counsel for the Respondent," and expressly states that "the facts sworn to are of an equivocal character, and the opinions of Mr. and Mrs. Butler not conclusive to my mind." His verdict then on this Article was based, not on the evidence adduced, but on the supposed admissions of counsel.

Now it is a grave question, how far these admissions (allowing them to have been made) ought to have prevailed in the minds of the Judges. It was their duty, and the duty of each one of them, to hear patiently *all* the evidence, to weigh it impartially, to decide according as they believed it sufficient or insufficient to prove the facts alleged, and to give the defendant the benefit of any doubts they might have as to the clear proof of his guilt. Bishop Onderdonk had appeared alone in the first part of the trial, and entered the plea of *Not Guilty*. This plea was never retracted by him, either directly or indirectly, during the trial, nor did his counsel ask leave to withdraw it, and enter the plea of *guilty* to any of the charges. When then was this admission made, on which the Bishop of Connecticut so strongly relies? It must have been in the summing up of these counsel, and then (if the Bishop is correct in his statement of facts) we have the most extraordinary conduct exhibited by them that was ever heard of in a court of justice. The facts alleged have been insufficiently proved; *opinions* have been brought forward, nearly if not entirely worthless, to prove the accused guilty of intoxication—no! stop!—of *improper excitement* by vinous or spirituous liquors!—an acquittal may be confidently looked for, and the counsel prevent it by themselves admitting that he is guilty! I am confident that if the counsel for a prisoner, in a criminal court, was to make such an admission, in the absence of all evidence to convict, he would immediately be checked by the court, and that his admissions would be set down to the score of ignorance, if to no worse motive. The jury would be charged to determine upon the *evidence, and that alone;* and it was upon the *evidence alone* that the Bishop of Connecticut should have decided the question of guilt on the second count of the Presentment.

If, however, I am wrong in my estimate of the powers of counsel in criminal cases, and the Bishop has legal authority for the principle of his decision, it will not avail him as to the facts of the case. *No such admission was made* by either of the counsel in question, to the best of my knowledge and belief—and we have in this case a lamentable proof of the liability not only of ordinary men, but even of Bishops, to err.

Mr. Graham says, p. 163:

"These, then, are the circumstances as detailed by Mrs. Butler. Now, suppose that every word were true, what is the *gravamen* of the charge against the Bishop? I apprehend it is the intoxication. It is, indeed, made the subject of a specific charge. I respectfully submit, then, that this is the *gravamen* of the charge put forth by Mr. and Mrs. Butler; because, if he were in the state described by the latter, then the moral motive could not have attached independently of the act of intoxication; and on this subject, without dwelling upon it, for I do not mean to make it a prominent ground of defence, I offer the very sound rule of law as to how far intoxication may be taken as explaining the motive of a supposed crime I am aware that the general principle in courts of law is, that intoxication aggravates the crime, because the party is then guilty in a double sense, having first made himself an irrational being, and then committed the offence. But when the crime depends on motive, or intent, the law admits the distinction that then the intoxication may be regarded upon the question of motive, and the crime itself, so far as intent is concerned, may be held not to have been committed. I refer on this subject to 1 *Russell on Crimes*, p. 8, where it is said, that "although voluntary drunkenness cannot excuse from the commission of a crime, yet when, as upon a charge of murder, the material question is, whether an act was premeditated, or done only with sudden heat and impulse, the fact of the party being intoxicated has been holden to be a circumstance proper to be taken into consideration." There, as here, the question is one simply of intent. It is that which constitutes the crime; and the circumstance of intoxication is, therefore, proper to be taken into consideration, for the obvious reason that it goes to show that the act was induced by a state of feeling which of itself deprives it of deliberate intent, and renders the allegation of immorality and impurity on the part of the Respondent entirely untenable. I put it to the Court, then, as a consideration entitled to great weight, not as controverting the general principle respecting the immorality of intoxication, but as showing that the intent and motive are explained away by the attendant circumstances."

And again, p. 167:

"I shall, before leaving this subject, however, refer for a moment to the charge of intoxication. Suppose it to be proved, as it is charged, that the Respondent, on a certain occasion, seven or eight years ago, had drunk too freely of wine, and was somewhat excited by it. Is it not sufficient to say that that is the only charge, and only pretence of any accusation of that character throughout the whole of that time? And I ask, whether, even supposing that fact to be admitted by the Respondent, any member of the court would hesitate a moment in discharging him from any necessity of entering on an explanation of that circumstance, or even any penitence on the subject, by reason of the fact that his whole course of life, both before and since that occurrence, is a sufficient atonement for that exception to his general conduct. This of itself is a reason, and strong argument in favor of the position which I assumed at the outset of my remarks, that the present immorality—the present unfitness—the present condition of mind of the party—is, after all, whatever the form of the specifications, the only legitimate subject of inquiry."

The counsel, by way of argument, in the first quotation, says the *intent* being the great question in the first charge, the acts were committed under a state of feeling which deprived them of *deliberate* intent, and rendered the allegation of *immorality* and *impurity* wholly untenable. He is merely *arguing on a supposition*, and no one can justly say that he admits the fact of intoxication *absolutely* against the Respondent. So in the second quotation; he merely *argues* that, *supposing it to be proved* that the Respondent was unduly excited by wine on that one occasion, yet, as that was one solitary instance in a long course of years, he was entitled to an acquittal. But so far was he from admitting the statements of Mr. and Mrs. Butler to be true in themselves, that he endeavors to show them to be wholly unworthy of credit; and at the conclusion of his speech he declares his unfeigned conviction "*of the entire innocence of the accused.*" He therefore did not admit the truth of the second article of the Presentment.

Let us then examine the summing up of Mr. Ogden, in reference to this matter. He says, p. 216:

"In the next place, in regard to this matter of Mrs. Butler, the reason of the Bishop's conduct is, throughout their testimony, placed on the ground that he was intoxicated. That it was so, cannot be denied by the Presenters, because in the very charge it is stated that he was intoxicated or drunk. Now, I beg leave to remind the Court, that the charge here is immorality and impurity. It is a charge directly affecting the heart and intentions of the Bishop at that time. It is not like a case of crime at law, where drunkenness is an exaggeration of the offence; but it proceeds entirely on the idea that there were impure and immoral intentions in the mind of the Bishop at that time. Now, if he were so intoxicated that he could have no use of his mind—so intoxicated that he did not know what he was about—then the Court must say that drunkenness was the crime, and not the conduct on which the complaint is founded. I admit that drunkenness is an immorality. There is no question about that. But all that I desire to impress upon the Court is, that if these witnesses are to be believed, and the second article in the Presentment is to be believed, all these acts were done when he was intoxicated. But, says the gentleman, why this is no justification Stil, I answer, there is no crime charged here. There is no technical crime charged here. But to show what these Presenters think of that immorality, they have attached to it the word "impurity" a term not used in the Canon, showing their idea of it; that when the Canon speaks of immorality, they meant impurity. Now, a case has been cited, by my associate from Russell, that in murder, the highest crime, except treason, known to the law, there must be clearly made out premeditated malice; and drunkenness is always to be taken into consideration by the jury in passing upon a man accused of that crime. But here, when the entire offence charged consists of impurity of heart, drunkenness is, in my opinion an entire defence.

If I am right here, then I ask the Court, are you prepared to convict this man of drunkenness, because, to use the language of Mrs. Butler, he was "overtaken" seven years ago? Is subsequent repentance not to be allowed! Is the fact of a man's continuing from that time till this, sober, and abstaining entirely from all excess, to be no excuse for that solitary act committed seven years ago? In other words, are you to degrade and destroy this man on account of circumstances that took place seven years ago; and of the repetition of which there is no evidence under heaven before you?

But let us examine Mrs. Butler's evidence a little more. Now suppose she was mistaken, and that the Bishop was perfectly sober, is there any thing in her testimony proving any impurity on the part of the Bishop? I say there is not."

The counsel evidently pursues the same system with Mr. Graham. First he assumes an aspect of the case more unfavorable for his client, and shows that even then he is entitled to an acquittal; and having done this, he proceeds effectually to demolish the evidence of Mr. and Mrs. Butler, and "prove their own story entitled to no consideration." He therefore did not admit the truth of the second article of the Presentment.

The Bishop of Connecticut, then, was *mistaken* in his assumption that they *did admit* the fact of intoxication, but on this mistaken assumption rested the whole burden of his verdict of *guilty on the second article*, and his verdict, by his own showing, should have been *not guilty*. He has, while intending to do right, inflicted a grievous wrong on a brother Bishop, and as an honorable man, an estimable citizen, and a Christian prelate, is bound to make all the reparation he can; and this reparation, I doubt not, he will make, to the utmost of his ability.

In like manner he erred in his reasons for his verdict on the first count of the Presentment. They are three in number: 1—the testimony of Mr. and Mrs. Butler; 2—their being *circumstantially supported by the facts proved under the 7th and 8th specifications;* and 3—their being *virtually admitted as true by both the counsel* for the Respondent. The third reason is wholly suppositious, as we have seen no such admission of guilt was made by the counsel. The second is also worthless, for how can acts committed seven years ago be *circumstantially* supported by others committed four years after, at an entirely different time and place, before different parties, and wholly disconnected with the former? If this reason has any meaning it must be this, that believing the testimony under the 7th and 8th articles, the Bishop was *more disposed* to give weight to that under the 1st; and instead of weighing the evidence as given in support of the latter, by itself, he added to it the *presumption* created in his mind that the defendant was guilty. This prepossession was increased by the supposed admission of the counsel, and he was thus rendered incapable of rendering a verdict on the evidence alone, which was his bounden duty as a Judge in the highest court of the Church. Had he been a civil judge, and charged a jury to find a defendant guilty on these grounds, most certainly the verdict would have been set aside for misdirection. Is the wrong less in this case, because there is no appeal to a higher tribunal? The new trial would be granted in order to avoid injustice, and to prevent the rights of a fellow citizen from being violated and trampled upon. Is the emergency less when the rights, the standing, and the character of a Bishop of the Church of God have been grievously violated and degraded?

The Bishop, in like manner, rests his verdict of guilty on the 5th and 6th counts, in great measure, on the supposed fact that the 1st and 2d have been fully proved, and we have a right to object to the verdict on that ground, and claim that the whole opinion should be set aside.

To little and ungenerous minds, the confession of error appears the hardest of tasks. Conscious of the feeble hold they have on the affections and estimation of their fellow men, they fear to weaken it yet more by the acknowledgment of errors of judgment and mistakes in reasoning, and obstinately persist in the wrong, when a prompt retraction would have spared them both shame and anguish. The noble and elevated spirit has no such fears; he values the rights and the interests of his fellow men far more than his own gratification or importance; he cannot rest tranquilly under the imputation of wrong doing, and the pangs of a wounded conscience, and gladly seeks relief in the acknowledgment of error and in the reparation of the fault, unwittingly committed. Such has always been the case with those great names who have adorned the bench of England, as recorded in their memoirs. We find a Mansfield, a Kenyon, an Ellenborough and an Eldon sometimes mistaken, though it happens rarely—they do not stubbornly maintain their opinions in defiance of their colleagues and of the bar, but win fresh laurels by the frankness of their acknowledgment of error. If these great luminaries of the law were willing to confess an occasional mental eclipse, and shone the brighter by its contrast with their general character, surely the Bishop of Connecticut need not fear that his reputation will be injured or the respect with which he is so universally regarded be diminished by the acknowledgment that he erred in his verdict on this unhappy trial. It may well have been that an imperfect hearing of the counsel, or an incorrect view of the scope of their arguments, produced the impression, which led to the conclusion that I humbly trust has been proved contrary both to law and to fact. I place too much confidence in his honorable disposition and love of justice to suppose for a moment that he will persist in an adherence to his verdict, merely because he has once said it, and will esteem it as "the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not." I look forward to the next General Convention in the full assurance that this venerable man will be found foremost among his brethren to give such relief as the nature of the case requires, to put an end to the operation of the sentence under which the Bishop of New-York has suffered for nearly three years, and thus give tranquility and peace to this once united and prosperous Diocese. If that diocese is to suffer and be wounded, let the suffering and wounds come from Puritan hands, and not from the successor of Seabury, the chief pastor of the oldest diocese in the Union, and the first on the Episcopal Bench who maintains sound Church principles.

JURISCONSULTUS.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—So much has been written upon the subject of the Presentment and trial of the Bishop of New York, it would appear as if ingenuity itself must, by this time, be exhausted. Yet we do not find this to be the case. Every scrutiny into the remarkable state of the public mind, and more memorable proceedings of certain Right Rev. Fathers of the Church with others of lower stations, brings to light and deepens the conviction of the injustice, cruelty and wrong done the Rt. Rev. Benjamin Treadwell Onderdonk.

"To detect and expel every thought, every feeling, every opinion, and every prejudice, inconsistent with the impartial discussion of this case, is the high and solemn, and, I may add, awful duty of every member of this Court. You are to judge in this case, and after you have judged it, you yourselves are to be judged, not by the Church of this diocese only, but by that great company which composes the Church of the United States."

Versed in the science of law, and still more, perhaps, in the knowledge of human nature, the Counsel for the Presentment uttered a prediction, which the period of two and a half years has not failed to verify: *you are be judged by the Church of New York.*

If there be any reality in those convictions of natural justice, which, under the dew of a general grace derived to all mankind through the Saviour, arise spontaneous in the mind and heart, then, surely, we may hope that the General Convention will not fail, in due time and in a lawful way, to pass its judgment upon the decision of the majority of the Court: *you are to be judged by the Church of the United States.*

It would be wrong to say that this was made with any reference to that retributive providence, which has so often, in the diocese of New York, sustained the innocent against the combinations of the guilty. Yet it would appear as if *he* was not without some misgiving that injustice, under the extraordinary circumstances of the case, would be done; "and if your decision shall commend itself to the approval of your own consciences, in the sight of God, it will, I doubt not, receive the approbation of the Church of Christ." This warning was more solemn than the Counsel was aware of under the impatience and lightness of mind which characterized him on that occasion.

Cannot something be done by those who have it in their power to alleviate the stubborn influences which yet keep down the manly qualities of the regenerated mind and heart? Already have strange revelations been made by means of the late investigations of "the Proceedings of the Court," under your editorial pen; particularly in reference to the origin of that detractive spirit of slander, which, in professedly evangelical circles, under the injunction, "say not a word about it; I tell it to you in confidence," has spread, causing division and strife, throughout the length and breadth of these United States.

It is worse than idle to endeavor to persuade ourselves that all things will go on well, if we do not use in a lawful way all the influence which the kind providence of God has put in our power. Although the friends of the "moral and religious feeling of the Church" are not responsible for the publication of the Proceedings, yet they should gladly avail themselves of the opportunity to read and weigh them. It is believed, that in nine cases out of ten, where there is an honest mind to know the truth, the result will be a firm conviction of the entire innocence of the Respondent.

But more than this: they are the legitimate source of authority, from which we obtain evidence for the conviction of those who have escaped an Ecclesiastical Court. When the adhesiveness of personal and party relations, shall have relaxed, the men who have been concerned in a professed zeal for the duty and office of the Bishop and purity of the Church, will, no doubt, get the unanimous verdict of having been the great "scandal, disgrace and injury" of the Church of the day.

It would be treason against the Church in the great interests of truth and righteousness, not to acquaint ourselves with the whole history of the controversy which has taken place within our borders during the last ten or twelve years. It is only with a knowledge of facts, circumstances, persons and principles, we can make ourselves, under the influence of a logical mind, masters of the most remarkable era in the American Church.

It is hoped there is enough of manly piety in all the dioceses of this wide extended country, to investigate this subject; and, having formed its convictions of right and wrong, to express, in a suitable way and proper manner, those opinions and sentiments. This may be in some cases a small number; where the wisdom of the serpent and the harmlessness of the dove will be eminently required; yet it should be done: dearer interests and rights are at the foundation of this commotion, than any political ones we possess. If brazen faced impudence dares where it is in the minority, to charge concealed infidelity upon the pen of a clergyman which vindicates a Bishop of the Court from the charge in public print of having in his Grounds of Opinion "done violence to the moral sense of by far a majority in our Church," there is little hope that a majority will, any where, treat a minority with any regard to courtesy or christian principle. A moral daring has its own reward here, and the hope of sure felicity hereafter.

INVESTIGATOR.

For the Churchman

Rev. Mr. Editor,—Allow me to offer my congratulations to you on the grand display in the editorial columns of the Protestant Churchman of last week. Somebody apparently one of the secret wire-movers of that precious concern, has given his readers about two columns of fustian and trash, no-law, no-logic, and no-manners. As the author very justly terms you a "wonderful man," I may apply to him in turn the words of Dryden, and guess that behind the screen is one,

"For close designs and crooked counsels fit,
Sagacious, bold, and turbulent of wit;
Restless, unfixed in principles and place;
In power unpleased, impatient of disgrace;
A fiery soul, which, working out its way,
Fretted the pigmy body to decay,
And o'er informed the tenement of clay
In friendship false, implacable in hate,
Resolved to ruin or to rule the state."

Absalom & Achitophel.

The aim of the writer, whoever he may be, appears to be this, to make people believe that the eleven bishops who found Bishop Onderdonk guilty are too *holy* to have erred in law or in fact!!! Here is infallibility with a vengeance, and it is calculated to "outrage the moral sense of the community"—

"I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word."

It is amusing to see how convenient a plea this of holiness is becoming in certain quarters. I was looking over the last pamphlet of Major Douglass alluded to by a correspondent of yours some time since, and found the following *apropos* passage—"As to the presumption against my "statement" on the ground that it impeaches the character and conduct of Bishop McIlvaine." This is a point of some importance. Almost every page of the "Reply" is drawn up in some dependence, more or less, upon this presumption; but of course it could not be stated as fully and explicitly under the *proof reading* of Bishop McIlvaine himself as it has since been in certain religious newspapers. The amount of it as there insisted upon appears to be that so eminent and holy a Bishop, full of zeal and eloquence, more than ordinarily *spiritual* in his views, and above all the champion of doctrinal purity in opposition to the errors of a corrupt and schismatic church, is not to be held *capable of doing wrong* or subject to a *charge* of wrong doing on any evidence; and such is the import of the etiquette assumed by the Bishop in the matter of my accounts. (Reply p. 24.) Was it for the *order* of Bishops in general that this immunity was claimed, or for Bishop McIlvaine in particular? Recent events answer, beyond the possibility of being misunderstood, *the latter;* and we have this curious anomoly; "a man in this republican country, in the 19th century, ready to die in the last ditch of a dogmatical controversy with Papal Rome, broadly and boldly appropriating one of the most arrogant pretensions of the most corrupt period of that very Rome—pontifical infallibility"—See p. 13 of the "Further Statement."

It will be seen that according to the doctrine of development this plea of *infallibility on account of holiness* has been communicated from *one* to *eleven* bishops, although one of them was found "guilty without criminality," and that the said infallibility which once extended only to questions of arithmetic and veracity has now the wider applications to all questions of law and evidence. Where it will reach to in course of time Heaven only knows, and how many other Bishops will obtain the stamp of *infallibility on account of holiness*. The power of canonization seems to lie in the Protestant Churchman and Episcopal Recorder, and I hope they will let us know from time to time what additions have been made. The Bishop of Missouri it is to be feared is *unholy* and *fallible*. A Canon has been recently passed in that Diocese requiring the consent of the Bishop to the admission of a Rector to a parish and his resignation of the same, and it has been broadly intimated in the Protestant Churchman that the Domestic Committee ought to interfere, and *stop the supplies till the Canon is repealed*. As that Committee has seen necessary to make an appeal for aid to the Church at large, I trust that all sound Churchmen will require a very full disclaimer on their part of this infamous proposal before they give one cent to their funds. If five clergymen and five laymen, or a majority dare to dictate to a sovereign member of our Confederation what canons she must pass, and what steps she must pursue to please them, and entitle herself to receive the miserable pittance they graciously deign to bestow, they must be brought to their senses by the indignant voice of the Church, and by sternly withholding from them the means of injustice and oppression.

M. N.

That man has most attained unto evangelical righteousness who is the most thoroughly penitent, the most truly humbled; and all christian good works lead to this humiliation.—*Williams.*

One sinner [the penitent thief] is converted at the hour of death, that we may hope; and but one, that we may fear.—*Quesnel.*

THE CHURCHMAN.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 7, 1847.

FLOYD SMITH, General Agent, No. 12 John-st up stairs

Having reviewed the first and second Articles of the Presentment, we come next to the third and fourth, with which, for convenience sake, we shall connect the ninth. This last indeed was stricken from the Presentment, and on the third and fourth the Respondent was found *Not Guilty*, but all three, nevertheless, afford matter for grave reflection.

In order to show the true meaning of these articles, and their relation to the main design of the Prosecution, it is necessary to keep in view the introductory paragraph of the Presentment, which is as follows—

PRESENTMENT.

To the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

The undersigned, that is to say, the Right Reverend William Meade, Bishop of the said Church in the Diocese of Virginia, the Right Reverend James Hervey Otey, Bishop of the said Church in the Diocese of Tennessee, the Right Reverend Stephen Elliott, jun., Bishop of the said Church in the Diocese of Georgia, do hereby, in virtue of the canonical authority reposed in them, present to their brother Bishops, the Right Reverend Benjamin Tredwell Onderdonk, Bishop of the said Church in the Diocese of New York, as being guilty of immorality and impurity in the several specifications herein more particularly set forth; and they do solemnly demand a trial of the said Benjamin Tredwell Onderdonk, pursuant to the provisions of the canons of the General Convention of the said Church, in such case made and provided.

Here the Presenters make the general charge that the Rt. Rev. Dr. Onderdonk is "guilty of immorality and impurity," and they refer to the several articles following for "specifications" of certain particular acts, with time, place, and circumstances pertaining to each, in which the immorality and impurity are alleged to have been manifested.

Now it is evident, we think, that the acts thus specified ought to be 1. definite, and 2. adequate to sustain the charge. If the particular acts are not definitely stated, it is impossible to understand what they are; and in this case no intelligible issue can be made by the accusers and the accused, or tried by the Court. If they are definitely stated, but are inadequate to sustain the charge, then the issue respecting them, however intelligible, will be vain; for what can be more vain than the expensive array and elaborate examination of witnesses, the keen collision of counsel, and the solemn decision of judges in regard to an alleged act which, even if truly alleged, is no proof of guilt.

The necessity of these requisitions is so obvious that there would be just ground of complaint if they were not required by the Canon. Much more ground of complaint will exist, if they are required by the Canon and have been neglected by the Presenting Bishops and the Court.

The Canon says that "The Trial of a Bishop shall be on a Presentment in writing, and specifying the offence of which he is alleged to be guilty, with reasonable certainty as to time, place and circumstances. Such Presentment may be made for any Crime or Immorality, for Heresy, for Violation of the Constitution or Canons of this Church, or of the Church of the Diocese to which he belongs." "Specifying the offence" cannot well be understood to denote the preferment of a general charge: it rather presupposes a general charge of which the *offences specified* are particular instances. Or if "specifying the offence" be understood to denote the general charge, still the spirit of the Canon, for the reasons above given, obviously requires that the particular allegations be both definite and adequate to sustain the charge preferred.

In examining each Article of the Presentment, therefore, we are to look at the *acts alleged* in order to determine whether they be or be not "proper for trial." If the acts alleged are definite and adequate, either in their own nature or by reasonable construction, to sustain the charge of Immorality and Impurity, then the particulars of time, place and circumstance, the terms "impurely and unchastely," and the declared "scandal and injury to the Church," are congruous to the acts themselves, and important as serving to denote their presumptive certainty, intent and turpitude. But if the acts alleged are vague and indefinite, or if they are not, either in their own nature or by reasonable construction, instances and proofs of immorality and impurity, it is difficult to see how the above named accessaries (*viz.* the imputation of bad motives, the mention of time, place and circumstances, and the declared "scandal and injury of the Church") can invest them with a character which they do not possess and render them what they are not in themselves, fit subjects of judicial cognizance.

Reasonable as these rules are, and required as they are by the spirit if not indeed (as we understand them to be) by the very letter of the Canon, they have yet been strangely overlooked by the Court to the great injury of the rights and reputation not only of the Bishop of this Diocese, but of the Diocese itself. In our review last week of the second article of the Presentment we pointed out one, and we now proceed to point out other and more flagrant instances of this injustice.

The ninth article of the Presentment is as follows—

And the said Bishops presenting do further present and allege, that at sundry other times within the seven years last past, the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk, while Bishop of said Diocese of New York, and within the limits of the said Diocese, has impurely and unchastely laid his hands upon the bodies of other virtuous and respectable ladies, whose names have come to the knowledge of the said Bishops, so that he is of evil report within the limits of the said Diocese, and in other parts of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America; to the manifest scandal of the Church of Christ, and the disgrace of the office of the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk: and nothing prevents the presentation of these cases on separate specifications, but the want of a civil process by which to compel witnesses to testify to the truth of these matters.

It is true that the Court ordered this article of the Presentment to "be stricken out as not proper for trial." But why? Because the act alleged in it was not an instance of immorality and impurity? No; but for the sole reason that it was "without reasonable certainty as to time, place and circumstances." For so runs the order—

It was ordered by the Court, that so much of the Presentment as is contained in the ninth article of the said Presentment, be stricken out as not proper for trial, being without reasonable certainty as to time, place, or circumstances.

No exception is taken to the act alleged, but only to the omission to specify the time, place and circumstanses in which it occurred. The act alleged is thus acknowledged to be a proper matter for the presentment and trial of a bishop, and the Presenting Bishops are upheld by the Court for making it matter of Presentment and trial. What, then, is the act alleged? It is that the Respondent "laid his hands upon the bodies" of ladies whose names are not given. Now we do not deny that *the laying on of hands may* be an act of impurity, or an act of violence, but we hope it will be allowed that it *may* also be an act of piety and religion, having been practised in all ages for the cure of the body and the strengthening of the soul by means of the heavenly benediction which has been believed to accompany it. What then is the fact? Why that the Bishops of Virginia, Georgia and Tennessee have presented the Bishop of this Diocese for having "laid his hands" on a portion of his Diocese, and summoned him to the proof that this act did not proceed from impure and unchaste motives; and that the Court of assembled Bishops have actually sustained them in this presentment and summons.

We do not impute to the Presenting Bishops, in regard to this any more than in regard to the second article of the Presentment, an intention to bring the holy ordinances of Christianity into contempt. They did not reflect that they were expressing the matter of their allegation against a brother bishop in the identical words which the Holy Scriptures use to express the holiest of the Episcopal functions; for if they had reflected, we have the charity to believe that they would not thus have furnished occasion of impure associations and wanton jests to the giddy and profane. But we cannot so readily acquit them of the blame of a deliberate intention to prejudice the cause of the Respondent in the minds of his judges, and to blast his reputation with the public. To what better motive can the above article be ascribed? To say nothing of the matter of the allegation, the article is wanting in the specification of time, place and circumstance, plainly required by the Canon, and it was on this account promptly and unanimously ruled out by a Court not over-rigid in the application of those rules which are prescribed not less by Justice than by Mercy as the safeguards of Innocence. The Presenting Bishops saw at least these defects of the Article, and they must, therefore have expected that it would be stricken out by the Court. With what good motive, then, could they have preferred an accusation which they knew that the Court *could not* entertain? But the Article is wanting in another specification, the want of which, although the Court has not noticed it, is more discreditable to the Presenters, and sheds broader light on their motives. It specifies, indeed, the act which it includes in the charge of immorality and impurity, but it specifies no object of the act. Of course the Article declares an object, otherwise it would be nonsense, but it specifies none; for the reference to "virtuous and respectable ladies," without the mention of a name, or any thing else that may serve as a clew to their identity, is no specification. What would be thought of the country in which a man could arrest a merchant or tradesman on the charge of defrauding his customers without naming a single customer defrauded? The like to this has been done by three bishops, and allowed by an Episcopal Court, acting under the authority of our General Convention. To this absence of all specification of the object, time, place and circumstances of the act, add now the matter of the allegation, *viz.* that "he *laid his hands*," an act which is, towards many objects, in many times and places, and under many circumstances, an act (to say nothing of piety) of courtesy, humanity, benevolence, and of the purest, chastest and most innocent affection, and consider this act as brought to sustain a charge of immorality and impurity without the specification of an object, or of a single particular which can give the faintest color of justice to such a construction, and say if the preferment of such a charge does not reveal the genius of calumny as its author? Is there in all the annals of Puritanical fanaticism, or fanatical affectation of purity, an instance of petty persecution, the motive of which rested on so contemptible a pretext, and covered itself with so flimsy and transparent a veil?

Certainly if Bishop Meade and his two coadjutors, who were the nominal principals in this movement, had wished to compass the ruin of an innocent man, they could not have hit upon a more promising expedient than is found in the presentment of this ninth article against Bishop Onderdonk. They select a particular individual, (who in this instance happens to be the Bishop of this Diocese,) charge him with immorality and impurity, and seek to prop up the charge by the allegation of an act which may, indeed, by a bare possibility, flow from a bad motive, but which in nine hundred and ninety-nine instances out of a thousand is prompted by a pure and innocent intention. They thus suggest an impure and malicious construction of an incident to the minds of thousands to whom, but for this suggestion, such a construction would never have occurred. They thus render the man an object of public suspicion and distrust; and then, as if knowing how hardly suspicions, when once excited, are allayed, and how rapidly they are converted, in most minds, into convictions, they boldly add that the individual whom they thus accuse on the authority of irresponsible informants, "is of evil report;" as indeed every man soon would be who is publicly arraigned before a Court of Justice on accusations which, however baseless and false, it is impossible to refute; and the effects of which can be but partially obliterated by the punishment of their authors.

There can be no justification of this conduct, and every attempt to palliate it only serves to set in a worse light. It may be said, indeed, that this allegation is found in a presentment which contains other allegations which bear a sort of resemblance to this, and which were accompanied with due specifications. But this is only a new statement of the outrage and not a mitigation of it. It neither furnishes nor suggests an answer to the question, Why was this ninth article introduced? The allegation could not be proved, could not be investigated by the Court; why then was it made? Why were not the specific allegations left to stand on their own merits? The only answer to be given is, that the Presenters saw that the specific allegations would not alone accomplish the ruin of the Respondent; the testimony was feeble, and the pretended facts were insulated and remote; and it was necessary to bias the minds of the judges by the force of suspicions and prejudices in order to gain their assent to the testimony, and to connect the pretended specific facts with others of a more general and familiar sort, in order to give them a present and enduring importance, and to diffuse the odium of them over the whole life, character and deportment of the Respondent.

And the result was conformable. At the time the Presentment was got up Bishop Onderdonk was not "of evil report" in the Diocese, nothing like it, nothing approaching to it; but after the trial was over and the record of it was published, the "evil report" began; then the eyes of men were opened: they had the knowledge of evil where before they had known only good; and the past, all of a sudden, exchanged the livery of green for a sickly and yellow hue. The charity of the Gospel gave place to the charity of the Presenters; the charity which covereth sins wherever they exist, to the charity which discovereth them where they exist not; and the family hearth was desecrated, and the peace of the dead was invaded for the discovery of names and fabrication of reports which might give a form and appearance of reality to this ninth article of the Presentment.

But whatever may have been the design of the Presenters, one thing is certain; and that is, the Bishop of this Diocese has been presented before a Court acting under a Canon of the General Convention, and called upon to vindicate himself from the charge of immorality and impurity for the simple act of having "*laid his hands on the bodies*" of unknown members of his diocese. The Presentment has not been excepted to by the Court on this ground. It stands, therefore, as a precedent for future action under the same Canon, and as an authoritative rule for its construction in cases which may hereafter arise. Now be Dr. Onderdonk who or what he may, is the Convention of this Diocese prepared to allow this invasion of its rights and dignity to pass without remonstrance? Is every other Diocese in the Union content to be liable to the like invasion? Are all the bishops in the Church severally prepared to adjust their necks to the same yoke at the bidding of any three of their number? Is the General Convention to be responsible for whatever errors accident or infirmity may occasion on the part of those acting under its authority, or will it provide a Court of Appeals for ensuring the administration of Justice conformably to the intent and spirit of its Canons?

We commence this week, on our first page, the publication of a promised series of articles in review of the Trial of Bishop Onderdonk. The author had divided what now appears as one number into two, but the delay occasioned by a failure of the mail has led us to comprise them both in one. The series will now be

completed in five numbers. The author is severe (how could he be otherwise,) on three of the Bishops; but one of these (Bishop Hopkins) is a high-minded man who knows how to take hard blows as well as to give them, and we hope that one effect of this discussion may be to induce others to imbibe a portion of the same magnanimity. We are exceedingly happy to see minds of such an order as this correspondent's turned to this subject. "Faithful are the wounds of a friend," and the Church has nothing to fear when the errors of her functionaries are exposed in terms which, without exciting bad passions, carry conviction to the reason. The article of "Investigator" also is a good sign, coming as it does from a Diocese which is believed to have furnished instigators and abettors of the presentment.

We have been obliged to defer our summary from foreign papers by the last arrival, in order to make room for the following interesting letter:

CONSTANTINOPLE, May 25, 1847.

Mr. Editor,—There was last evening put into my hands the Churchman of April 3d, and at the same time a note from a friend in this city, a faithful Armenian brother. I opened the last, first. It was an account, in part, of a visit by the Patriarch to Trinity Church, Pera, (the Frank quarter of Constantinople,) and the only Armenian Church in that quarter. The visit was on the 23d, (Whitsunday,) which this year falls on the same day both in the Eastern and Western Churches. Among other things, my friend, who was present at the morning service, says, "The Patriarch, in his sermon, spoke very strongly against Romanism, proving that Christ alone is the Head of the Church. There were a good number of Roman Catholics present [attracted doubtless by the Patriarch's visit] and he spoke in Turkish," [the language most commonly understood.]

I then opened the Churchman, in which you notice the establishment of an Armenian paper in this city, taking your information from the New York Observer, which has it from its Constantinople correspondent. Now I had already intended to say something upon that article, and I may as well do it in connection with your remarks, which are very just. The main bent of the writer's letter is to show that the new Armenian paper is papistical in its tone, and being the "official organ" of the Patriarch, he must also be papistical. Now it is a curious fact, that this Papistical Patriarch preached anti-papal sermons, as I have shown you above; and it is another curious fact, that, excepting the American dissenting missionaries, none write so bitterly against him, as some of the Roman Catholic correspondents of Roman Catholic newspapers. If you see the French newspapers, you will have seen confirmations of my remark. There must be something in this more than meets the eye in the New York Observer's letter. You have heard of the illustration of Church principles, (which Mr. Gresley has introduced into one of his volumes,) in which a man standing at one end of a line, is made to see another standing in the middle as if he were standing at the opposite extremity; and so I fear it is with the optics of the New York Observer's correspondent, and perchance of the Roman Catholic correspondents also.

But to the article. I will give you a running comment upon it. To prove that the Armenian newspaper is the "official organ" of the Patriarch, the writer says that "the press from which it issues is under his special protection," "and nothing can possibly come from it which has not his sanction." This being the case, you will be pleased to hear that Bishop Seabury's Sermon on Christian Unity was issued from this press, and the Church of England Prayer Book in Armenian is about to issue from it, the printing being nearly completed. Compare this now with the writer's subsequent assertion that, though the Patriarch may profess friendship towards our Church's representative in this country for the sake of deluding you at home, "he will never speak here a word that can ever reach the ears of his people implying that he is encouraging such friendly correspondence." The fact that our Prayer Book, &c. are issuing from his press, is something that speaks louder than words, though words have not been wanting, as I shall presently show you. The Patriarch not only "writes letters in English for publication in England and America," but those letters are freely circulated here both in English, which many Armenians know, and in the original. His letter to Bishop Southgate was shown to various individuals before it was sent, and a copy of it in Armenian was transmitted by the Patriarch to the Catholicos at Etchmiadzin, his ecclesiastical superior. The idea of the Patriarch's writing letters for England or America which could not be known here, is too absurd to require refutation. The seceders (to say nothing of others) see them, and they will not fail to publish them here, if thereby they can bring the Patriarch into disrepute. The idea, too, of his denying their authenticity, if brought home to him, is absurd, for he keeps them by him constantly for circulation, and freely gives them away to his visitors, which I have myself seen in many instances. The writer does not say he *has* denied their genuineness. He will hardly venture on such an assertion; but he might do so;—this is no more nor less than slander.

If the writer's "Episcopal brethren" have no "peculiar advantages" among the orientals, why are our dissenting brethren so sensitive upon this point? It is hardly worth while to be incessantly arguing a matter which is so clear as they pretend this to be. They seldom write any thing about us in which they do not show a peculiar tenderness upon this subject. I, for one, have no desire to *boast* of our advantages; but I trust we shall *use* them, whatever they may be.

The letter-writer thinks that the Patriarch's "official organ" makes no distinction "between *Episcopal* and *non-Episcopal* Protestants," but "unchurches and condemns the whole body together." Now, when the Armenian newspaper talks against "Protestantism," what does it mean? It means, of course, what Orientals always mean when they use that word. But "Protestantism" (for the word itself has come into use in this country) has a peculiar and definite meaning in the mouth of an Oriental. It means the denying of all Church authority, the absence of the acknowledged forms and institutions and doctrines of Christianity; it means, in a word, "infidelity." It has quite a different sense from what it has in the West. Now when an Oriental newspaper speaks against "Protestantism," it speaks against what I have just described. How far such an opposition affects *us*, I leave you to judge. But is it honest for this or any other letter-writer (for we have had the thing over and over again) to speak of Orientals as opposing "Protestantism," leaving it to be understood that it is the Protestantism of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Furthermore, the Armenian newspaper, so far as I have seen, has not used the word "Protestant," though my knowledge of its contents has not been very extensive. Certain it is that what it chiefly fights against is "New Sectarism." "New Sectaries" is a word coined among the Armenians about a year ago. It is applied exclusively to the members of the new sect formed by the American Dissenting Missionaries. The Patriarch has especially labored to bring it into use. *He* has a correct view of the word "Protestantism," and has therefore avoided the use of it in all his documents published here with regard to the "new sectaries." He has used it correctly in one of his Circulars published in English, which has appeared in some of our Church papers. He there intimates very plainly that he has no war with Protestants, and says that he knows these "New Sectaries" differ from many Protestants both in England and America. You will remember perhaps the passage. He has requested Bishop Southgate to prepare and publish in Armenian a treatise on Protestantism, that these distinctions may be known, which I hope will be done. The Patriarch has given too open and public a demonstration of his cordial friendliness to our Church's representative, to be misunderstood, even among his own people. He has visited him openly, called upon him for assistance in his schools, &c., sanctioned his publications, circulated here as well as in America and England his own letter to him, spoken of him in the most undisguised manner among his own people, committed students to him for instruction, kept up a constant and most familiar intercourse with him, and in every way in his power shown the evidences of a true friendship. He has spoken repeatedly in his Sermons of the "Anglican Church" in distinction from the "New Sectaries," and is most anxious that this distinction should be understood by his people. It is even for his own advantage that it should be understood, for the more his people know of the Anglican Church, whether in England or America, the less likely they will be to follow sectarian missionaries from those countries; and this has been the great cause of offence which those missionaries have taken from the distinctive presentation of our own Church in the East.

The letter-writer thinks that the Patriarch is "playing the hypocrite." This may be, for who knows the heart of man? But perhaps Bishop Southgate is in as good a position to judge of this matter as a writer who has not so much as seen the Patriarch since he has been in office. So long as we have such substantial expressions of good-will, we can afford to bear both with the suspicions of the letter-writer and the opposition of the "New Sectaries." You will observe that, in the extract which you give from the Armenian paper, this term is the only one applied to those in America whom the Editor is opposing. He says nothing of "Protestants," though the letter-writer himself puts in that word in brackets after "New Sectaries," as if it were a synonyme. It is needless, perhaps, to say that our mission, like our Church at home, knows nothing of a Protestantism which can stand in such a synonymy. To Protestantism we are sincerely attached, but it is the Protestantism of the Anglican Reformation, a Protestantism which is primitive and not "new," Catholic and not "sectarian;" it is anti-Romanism. In this the Eastern Churches, though not in the same degree, are sincerely and vigorously one with us; and there is no danger of our mission being confounded here, by any one who knows it as well as does the Armenian Patriarch, with the "new sect." As little danger is there that our Church at home will be confounded, by any such person, with the "New Sectaries" spoken of in the Armenian newspaper.

I have one word more to say of this Journal. Though we have no complaint to make against it on our own account, I must confess that one part of the letter-writer's statement is true. There was, in some of the early numbers, a tendency to "exalt Romanism and make it appear glorious." This was too manifest to be denied. The cause of this was that the principal Editor is himself at heart a Romanist, though in the Armenian Church. He is one of four or five whose purpose it evidently is to Romanize their Church. I should not say this without knowing it by such certain proofs as leave it beyond doubt; for I do not like the invidious way of attributing Romanistic views to those from whom one happens to differ, which is sometimes practised even among ourselves, and is not unknown here. This individual, with certain others, desired to establish a newspaper. The principal agent in the matter is an intimate friend of mine, and I can answer for him that no man of my acquaintance has less of a Romanizing tendency in him. He sought the Patriarch's permission, which is necessary for every publication, from a child's primer to a translation of the Scriptures. The Patriarch readily gave it, for he wishes to promote every good work among his countrymen. The Editor was selected as one of the best scholars in his nation. There was no thought of giving the paper a religious character, and therefore nothing was to be feared from his peculiar tendencies. He soon, however, manifested them, inserting laudatory articles concerning Rome, and in various ways giving the Journal the hue of his own theology. The Patriarch soon interfered, called the Editor to him, and gave him a severe rebuke. With all this, the Patriarch had no official connection with it whatever. I happen to know that he never read a copy of it until his attention was drawn to it by the complaints of its Papistical character. He then interposed to correct it. It was published at the press whence all his official documents are issued, but this is no more than is true of hundreds of other things with which the Patriarch has nothing to do beyond giving his permission for their publication. True, it could not be published there without his sanction, nor could it be published at any Armenian press without the same condition. The letter-writer says that after a time "notice was formally given that such religious news would hereafter be discontinued." The reason of this discontinuance the writer perhaps does not know. But I know it, for it is a matter of which I can say, *pars fui*. The Patriarch, finding that his admonition was not entirely heeded, (for something of the same sort again appeared,) sent once more for the Editor, and ordered him to discontinue his religious department altogether, and added, "If I see another article of this kind in your columns, I will forbid the publication of your paper." The Editor then ceased, but he partially effected his purpose by issuing a separate sheet once in six months filled with religious matter. This has appeared as yet only once. I do not know (for I cannot at present speak from careful examination) that it contains anything in praise of Rome, but it is certainly very hard upon the "New Sectaries," to which of course the Patriarch will not object. But nothing Romish will be suffered to continue. Of this you may be well assured. I was pleased with the spirit which the Armenians manifested when the first numbers appeared. As soon as they discovered its character, a goodly proportion of the subscribers sent back their copies, saying that they had "subscribed to an Armenian, and not to a Popish paper," and ordered it to be discontinued, though they thereby lost their subscription-money for the year. One of the principal cities in the Empire returned every copy that was received there, and sent at the same time a very strong representation to the Patriarch.

This is the whole truth of the matter. I should never have thought probably of telling it if the New York Observer's correspondent had not drawn it out, for it is one of those things which I observe but find no time to relate; one of those things which mark the progress of religious affairs in this country, the different influences at work, and the great strife which Catholic truth and unity are holding with Romanism on the one hand, and Puritanism on the other. Pray for the Church's mission here, that, between these two extremes, it may be found faithful to that trust which it is the only foreign agency that can defend.

In addition to the account of the Proceedings of the Indiana Convention, which will be found in another column, and have been kindly contributed by a member of that Convention, we have received a letter from another correspondent, who has had good opportunities to know the state of things in that Diocese, and who writes—"The Delegates to the General Convention are each and all true men—Catholics—who know the truth, and knowing, dare maintain it. Indiana, though small, is no mongrel. Her Delegation is a unit. Dr. Bowman was elected, not simply because he was a High Churchman, but because he was a Catholic Churchman, believing that he would administer the Diocese on Catholic principles. I hope we are not mistaken."

Under the head of "NOVELTIES [?]" the Calendar of last week repels some ill-natured animadversions which have been made on the infant Diocese of Missouri. It appears that one of its Canons makes the written consent of the Ecclesiastical authority necessary to the acceptance or relinquishment of a parochial charge. For this, it would seem, Missouri has been sneered at as *leading off in the great work of progressive development*, and as likely *to leave the Church principles of many Eastern Dioceses in the back ground.* The Calendar shows that the Missouri Canon is a transcript of one in the Diocese of Connecticut. It looks well for Bishop Hawks to see him not only assailed from such quarters but guarded against the assault.

For the Churchman.

CONVENTION OF INDIANA.

The tenth Annual Convention of the Diocese of Indiana held its sessions in St. Mary's Church, Delphi, Carroll County, on the 15th, 16th, and 17th days of July, 1847. There were present, the Bishop in charge of the Diocese, the Rev. Messrs. Brown, Croes, Fairchild, Fiske, Halsted, Harrison, Killikelly, Manney, and Vaux, and Lay Delegates from nine parishes. The Rev. Robt. B. Croes was elected Secretary, the Rev. Dr. Killikelly appointed Assistant Secretary, and the Hon. Judge Dunn re-elected Treasurer.

The following persons were chosen Deputies to the next General Convention, viz., *S. W. Manney, Rev. B. Halsted, Rev. W. Vaux*, and *Rev. R. B. Croes*; and Messrs. *Rees*, of Peru, *Carter*, of Michigan City, *Bailey*, of Fort Wayne, and *Jenners*, of La Fayette.

The Standing Committee were, by common consent, transferred from the central to the northern part of the diocese. The following are the members of that body for the present year, viz., Rev. Messrs. Manney, Halsted, and Brown; and Messrs. Franklin, Thwing, and Samuel Stewart, of La Porte, and H. C. Carter.

BP. KEMPER, in his Conventional Address, recommended the immediate election of a Diocesan for Indiana, and in reference to the consecration, said,—"that that event may take place before the present year has elapsed; I beseech you, for your own sake, and for the Church's sake, put forth your best efforts."

On motion, so much of the Bishop's Address as related to the election of a Diocesan was referred to a committee of three clergymen and three laymen. On Friday afternoon, the 16th inst., the committee reported favorably to the proposed measure, and the Convention resolved to go into an immediate election. After the members had united in prayer to God for guidance, the Clergy retired, and very soon returned to report that they had unanimously nominated the Rev. Dr. Bowman, Rector of St. James's Church, Lancaster, Pennsylvania. The Laity then retired and unanimously determined to confirm the nomination.

Appropriate resolutions were passed in reference to the measures which were to be adopted for the support of a Bishop, and for the support of a parochial assistant, in case the Diocesan takes charge of St. John's Church, La Fayette, to the rectorship of which the Rev. Dr. Bowman has been or will be elected. Mr. Peter P. Bailey was appointed a special agent under one of these resolutions, and from his known zeal and activity it is believed that he will succeed in what he undertakes.

Religious services were held in St. Mary's Church on Wednesday evening preceding the day of the annual meeting, and thrice on the Sunday following. During the session they were held twice daily. The Bishop preached thrice. The Convention and Missionary Sermons were delivered respectively by the Rev. Mr. Harrison and the Rev. Mr. Croes. The Rev. Messrs. Brown, Manney, and Vaux, also officiated in the pulpit. Great harmony prevailed throughout the session, and all seemed to appreciate the feeling of the Psalmist when he said, "Behold, how good and pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

The following is an extract from Bishop Kemper's Address—

"And now, brethren, the time has arrived when I ought to retire from the charge of this Diocese, in order that you may elect a Bishop to be exclusively your own. Your present interests and future growth require such a measure. The field is, and will probably continue to be, for a generation to come, a most arduous one. It is worthy the noblest and the untiring efforts of a true son of the Church, who has devoted all his powers and energies to the sacred cause, whose faith will increase with difficulties, and who will not, *who dares* not, refuse an office that is surrounded with toil and peril, with contempt and poverty. Such men are to be found, yea, I believe, they abound in the Church, and are rapidly increasing.

"I have loved you, and you have honored me. Our connection has been of the most interesting and gratifying nature, and our mutual intercourse has been characterized not only in private, but amidst all our deliberations by unity of sentiment, harmony of action, and Christian courtesy. I shall separate from you with regret, and shall always cherish the deepest interest in your spiritual welfare, and the growth of your infant diocese. I yet cling to my missionary office, and would magnify it; and shall not readily retire from it while health of body and vigor of mind are granted to me by the Father of our spirits. We have labored together, not unfaithfully I trust, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ;" and if we never meet again in this world, let us strive for that re-union, when, around the throne, all his ransomed ones shall ascribe praise, and honor, and glory, and blessing, unto Him who sitteth thereon, and unto the Lamb."

We regret to announce the loss of Christ Church, Anthony street, by fire. The fire communicated to the house of the Rector, the Rev. Dr. Lyell, adjoining the Church, but was happily soon extinguished. The Organ factory of Mr. Jardine, in which the fire originated, was wholly destroyed. All the buildings were partially insured, but the loss has nevertheless fallen heavily upon the sufferers, particularly on Mr. Jardine; who, however, with laudable energy, has promptly made arrangements for the continuance of his business. Mr. Jardine has had for some time a growing reputation as a manufacturer of organs, and we hope that the sympathy excited in his behalf by this misfortune, may be the means of increasing his patronage.

We infer from the annexed paragraph that Mr. Richmond's Challenge is favorably regarded in Boston, and likely to be accepted. We understand also that a new work by Mr. Richmond is in press, entitled "A Midsummer's Day Dream," &c., for an extract from which we shall endeavor to find room in our next.

Cambridge and Mr. Richmond.—There is good reason to expect that the forthcoming theological debate at Cambridge will be conducted in the most friendly and Christian spirit, not only from the character of the parties concerned, but from the preliminary steps which one of them has been careful to take. Mr. Richmond attended the exhibition last week, and was introduced to the Rev. Dr. Francis, to whom the challenge was enclosed, by the venerable Dr. Pierce, of Brookline. Mr. R afterwards dined in Hervard Hall, with the president, professors, and assembled clergy. We are informed that the utmost good feeling and harmony prevailed. It is earnestly hoped that the university will prove true to her appointed vocation, to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good," and that a champion of her present doctrines—which Mr. R. holds to be pernicious and destructive, both of Christianity and the state—will promptly be provided.

At a meeting of the Vestry and members of Calvary Church, Memphis, Tennessee, on Sunday, the 27th day of June, 1847, the following preamble and resolutions were adopted:

Whereas, Intelligence has been received of the decease of our beloved Pastor, the Rev. Philip W. Alston, who departed this life at the residence of Bishop Otey on the 18th inst., during the session of the Convention of this Diocese; and whereas, the sudden and unexpected death of a Christian minister endeared to the community by such extraordinary excellence of character, has filled the hearts of his congregation with a sense of overwhelming sorrow: be it therefore

Resolved, That we profoundly deplore the loss of an individual distinguished by talents so rare, by a learning so profound, by a piety so intense and exalted, by a life in every private and public aspect so pure and irreproachable, as an irreparable calamity to his Church and to society.

Resolved, That in testimony of our love and respect for the memory of the deceased, we will wear the usual badge of mourning for three months.

Resolved, That we deeply and tenderly sympathize with his bereaved family, and that we hereby tender to them the expression of a sincere and unaffected condolence.

Resolved, That these proceedings be published in the papers of our city, and in the leading Journals of the Church, and that copies of the same be forwarded to the family of the deceased, and to our beloved Bishop.

(Signed,) JAMES ROSE, Chairman.
JOHN P. TREZEVANT, Sec'y.

DOMESTIC INTELLIGENCE.

MASSACHUSETTS.—Bishop Eastburn, as we learn from The Christian Witness, has lately performed the following services in his Diocese:

Third Sunday after Trinity, June 20, confirmed 7 in St. John's, Jamaica Plain.

Sixth Sunday after Trinity, July 11. confirmed 7 in the temporary place of Worship, used by the congregation of the Church of the Messiah, Boston.

Seventh Sunday after Trinity, July 18, confirmed 8 in St. James's, Roxbury.

Wednesday, July 21, confirmed in a private house a sick parishioner of St. Matthew's, South Boston.

The Rev. R. T. S. Lowell has been received into this Diocese with letters dimissory from the Bishop of Newfoundland.

CONNECTICUT.—*Monument to the memory of Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D., first Bishop of Connecticut.*—It may probably be known to you, gentlemen, that the Parish of St. James, New London, (of which the lamented Prelate was so long Rector,) is about to lay the foundation of a new and spacious church, and it has been thought a very suitable occasion for some general expression of respect and veneration towards one so eminent in the sacred office, and so intimately associated with the early history of the Church in this Diocese and country. A Mural Monument has been proposed, as costly as the contributions will allow, and to occupy some prominent place in the new edifice.

We, therefore, in the discharge of our duty, respectfully invite your attention to this object, and beg permission to suggest, that some plan be adopted in your Parish, whereby all its members, and especially its communicants, may be allowed the opportunity of bestowing a definite sum, even though small, towards a memorial in every way so praiseworthy and well deserved. We would also desire you, *as earnestly as possible*, either to transmit, or name the amount collected, to the Treasurer of the Convention, Thos. Belknap, Esq., Hartford, Connecticut, or to the Chairman of the Committee.

Very truly, your obedient servants,
WILLIAM F. MORGAN,
WILLIAM JARVIS,
RICHARD ADAMS.

Norwich, Conn., July 1st, 1847. [*Calendar*.

PENNSYLVANIA.—The Rt. Rev. Bishop Potter made his visit to the churches in Schuylkill county, on the 11th of July. He preached in the morning at Minersville, in the new church lately erected there, under the superintendence of the Rev. M. Hirst and his vestry. The discourse was extemporaneous, and in the opinion of all who heard it was excellently adapted to the congregation.

In the afternoon the Bishop preached at St. James, Schuylkill Haven, on the education of children, and confirmed three persons. From Schuylkill Haven he proceeded to Pottsville, to lay the corner-stone of the new Trinity Church.—*Banner of the Cross.*

WESTERN NEW YORK.—Monday evening, July 19th, in Christ Church, Sackett's Harbor, the Bishop preached and confirmed two persons, making in all nine persons confirmed in this parish at this visitation. The Rev. Mr. Pise, of Manlius, read prayers, the Rev. Almon Gregory the lessons, and the Rev. Benj. Wright, the minister of the parish, the confirmation preface—the Rev. Mr. Renouf, of Lowville, being present.

Wednesday morning, July 21st, in Trinity Church, Watertown, the Bishop preached and confirmed fifteen persons, the Rev. Mr. Renouf, of Lowville, reading prayers, the Rev. Mr. Smith, of Camden, the first lesson, the Rev. Mr. Bartlett, of Pierrepont Manor, the second lesson, and the Rev. L. W. Norton, the minister of the parish, the confirmation preface. At the same time and place, the Rev. S. H. Norton, of Cape Vincent, the Rev. Levi W. Norton, of Watertown, and the Rev. Benjamin Wright, jr., of Sackett's Harbor, Deacons, were admitted to the holy order of Priests. The candidates were presented by the Rev. Mr. Pise, the Bishop administering the holy communion, assisted by the Rev. Mr. Rogers, of Greene, in the distribution of the consecrated bread, and by the Rev. Mr. Stone, of Oxford, and the Rev. Mr. Pise, of Manlius, with the cup—who also united with the Bishop in the laying on of hands. The other clergy present, were the Rev. Mr. Hill, of Brownville, and the Rev. Almon Gregory.

Thursday morning, July 22d, in St. Paul's Church, Brownville, the Bishop preached and confirmed thirteen persons, the Rev. Mr. Smith, of Camden, reading prayers, and the Rev. Mr. Norton, of Cape Vincent, the lessons. The Rev. Mr. Hill, the minister of the parish, read the confirmation preface. There were also present the Rev. Mr. Renouf, of Lowville, the Rev. L. W. Norton, of Watertown, and the Rev. Almon Gregory.

In All Saints' Church, Dexter, at 7 o'clock, P. M., the Bishop preached and confirmed four persons. Prayers were read by the Rev. Mr. Renouf, and the lessons by the Rev. Almon Gregory—the confirmation preface by the Rev. Mr. Hill, the Minister of the parish.

Friday afternoon, July 23d, in the Baptist house of worship at Three Mile Bay, prayers were read by the Rev. Mr. Renouf, of Lowville, and the lessons by the Rev. Mr. Starkey, of Penn Yan. The Rev. S. H. Norton, of Cape Vincent, and the Rev. Almon Gregory were also present.

July 25th, being the 8th Sunday after Trinity, in St. John's Church, Cape Vincent, morning prayer was read by the Rev. Mr. Starkey, of Penn Yan, and the lessons by the Rev. Almon Gregory. The Bishop preached and administered the holy communion, assisted by the Rev. S. H. Norton, minister of the parish.

In the afternoon of the same day, the Bishop preached and confirmed three persons in St. John's Church, Cape Vincent—the Rev. Almon Gregory reading prayers, the Rev. Mr. Starkey, the lessons, and the Rev. Mr. Norton, the confirmation preface.

Destructive Fire in Rochester.—From the Rochester Advertiser Extra, we learn that on Sunday morning, about two o'clock, flames were seen issuing from the belfry of St. Paul's or Grace Church, and in a few minutes, owing to the current of air, the whole steeple was enveloped in flames. Though the firemen were promptly on the ground, the whole interior was in a very short time in a blaze, and it was with difficulty the surrounding buildings, which were much damaged, were saved. The Library, with the exception of the books in the body of the church, was saved. The splendid organ and massive bell, which together cost about $2,000, were destroyed—the latter having given the *first alarm* in tolling its own doom, some one running to the rope as soon as the fire was discovered. The bell was melted, and the walls are all that remain of this noble structure, which cost about $25,000, of which $10,000 is covered by insurance. The fire is supposed to have communicated from a lamp which the sexton took with him into the steeple at nine o'clock on the previous evening.

The church has been a very unfortunate one. Twice the immense tower, which was originally carried to a great height, has fallen to the ground, and this, together with other disasters, has rendered it peculiarly unfortunate.

NEW JERSEY.—On Sunday, 18th July, (Seventh after Trinity,) in St. Paul's Church, Paterson, the Bishop admitted John A. Parsons to the holy order of Deacons. Morning Prayer was read by the Rev. Dr. Ogilby; the candidate was presented by the Rector, the Rev. J. Elliot Thompson; and the Bishop made the exhortation, and administered the holy communion.—*Missionary.*

MARYLAND.—The Rev. Dr. Atkinson, Rector of St. Peter's Church, Baltimore, has left this diocese for a foreign tour. He sailed from New York on Thursday, the 6th ult., in the packet ship New World, for Liverpool.

VIRGINIA.—We are indebted to the Southern Churchman for the following account of the Annual Examination of the Theological Seminary, of that Diocese, which took place last week:

The Annual Examination of the Students of the Seminary took place in the Chapel on Tuesday and the two succeeding days in the presence of the Bishops of the Diocese and the Board of Trustees—and indicated very commendable industry and successful application on the part of the Students.

On Thursday, the members of the Senior Class read Essays in the following order, and on the subject prefixed to their respective names, viz:

1. A future life promised by Christ in the Old Testament.—Wm. F. Bryant.
2. Parties in the Church.—J. A. Stone.
3. The one oblation of Christ.—R. A. Cobbs.
4. The practical relations of the doctrine of the Trinity.—E. T. Perkins.
5. Forms of Prayer.—J. P. Hammond.
6. Exegetical Study of the Scriptures.—W. C. Stout.
7. Tradition.—Wm. McGuire.
8. The nature and design of the Lord's Supper.—F M. Whittle.

The "Certificate" of having completed the regular and full course of the Seminary was conferred on the above named persons by the President of the Seminary, Bishop Meade.

Immediately previous to this concluding part of the exercises of the occasion, the audience listened with deep attention and with the highest gratification to a most admirable address from the Rev. Dr. Sparrow, Professor of Systematic Divinity in the Seminary, on "Subscription to Articles of Faith" required of ministers, in which, with great discrimination and ability, he pointed out the nature and limits of this requirement. The request that the Professor would consent to its publication will not, we hope, be denied. It will prove to candidates for orders especially a most valuable guide in their examination of a difficult subject, and will materially aid them in arriving at just and satisfactory conclusions respecting it—such as will both settle their minds and give quiet to their consciences.

On Friday, the 10th inst., in St. Paul's Church in this place, Bishop Meade admitted to Deacon's Orders, the following persons, members of the Graduating Class of the Seminary, viz: Robert Addison Cobbs, J. Pinckney Hammond, Wm. F. Bryant, Wm. McGuire, Edmund T. Perkins, Francis M. Whittle, and Wm. C. Stout. The first named person at the request of the Bishop of Alabama, and the last named, at the request of the Bishop of Louisiana. The morning prayer was read by the Rev. Dr. McGuire, of Fredericksburg; the candidates were presented by the Rev. Wm. N. Pendleton, late Principal of the High School; and the sermon was preached by the Rt. Rev. Nicholas H Cobbs, Bishop of Alabama. The *importance of faith* to every Christian and especially to ministers, was urged by the Rt. Rev. Preacher with great clearness, earnestness, and impressiveness.

It was truly gratifying to have this honored and beloved minister of Christ among us on this interesting occasion—the completion of his theological studies at our institution, of which he has always been a zealous friend, and supported admission to the sacred ministry.

INDIANA.—We have received from an attentive correspondent the following communication, for which we tender to him our thanks.

DELPHI, 16th July, 1847.

Mr. Editor,—The Convention of the Diocese of Indiana assembled in St. Mary's Church, Delphi, on Thursday, the 15th instant, when there were present of the clergy, the Rt. Rev. Jackson Kemper, D.D., Bishop in charge of the Diocese, and the Rev. Messrs. Brown, Fisk, Killikelley, Croes, Halsted, Manney, Fairchild, Harrison, and Vaux, with a very fair representation of the Parishes in the northern part of the State. The Convention is now about to close after a session of great harmony, in which matters were fully, freely and frankly discussed, relative to the present condition and future prospects of the Diocese of Indiana. And as the opinion appeared to be very generally entertained that a Bishop ought to be elected for this Diocese, the Convention unanimously elected the Rev. Samuel Bowman, D.D., Rector of St. James's Church, Lancaster, Pa., to that office for the Diocese of Indiana.

The Vestry of St. John's Church, Lafayette, have agreed to call the Bishop Elect, as the Rector of the Parish, with a salary of $600 per annum, and a commodious house in a beautiful situation, and it is proposed to add to the Bishop's income the sum of $500, to be raised by a tax on the parishes.

I am, dear sir, yours truly,
I. L. H.

The choice of a Bishop could not have fallen upon one more worthy of the high and Holy Office. His election too was entirely unanimous. Another esteemed correspondent says. "We trust he will not find it in his heart to decline such a call at such a time."

We are indebted to a friend in this city for the information that the following gentlemen were elected Delegates to the General Convention—Rev. R. B. Croes, Rev. S. W. Manney, Rev. B. Halsted, Rev. Wm. Vaux; Messrs. Carter, Sennees, Rees and Bailey.—*Banner of the Cross.*

LOUISIANA.—We have received the Journal of the Ninth Annual Convention of this diocese, held in New Orleans, April 14th–16th, 1847. It was attended by Bishop Polk, 13 of the clergy, and 24 delegates. Bishops Otey and Freeman were present during the session. Four new churches were admitted into union with the Convention. The Bishop's address reports 93 persons confirmed, 2 deacons and one priest ordained, and one church consecrated. The summary of Parochial Reports states that there have been for the last year, Baptized (infants 235, adults 106) 341; communicants (lost 42, added 120) 724; Marriages, 117; Funerals, 138; Sunday scholars, 623; contributions for Church purposes, $3,164. Standing Committee, Rev. Drs. Hawks and Lacey, and Mr. Goodrich, Messrs. Thomas Butler, T. Sloo, and L. C. Duncan. Delegates to General Convention, clerical, Dr. Hawks, Mr. Preston, Mr. Goodrich, and Mr. Lewis, lay, Messrs. Butler, Duncan, Ira Smith, and Lobdell.

Notices.

New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society.—A regular meeting of the Board of Managers will be held at the Church Depository, No. 20 John street, on Tuesday afternoon next, the 10th instant, at 5 o'clock.

WILLIAM H. BELL, Secretary.

August 7, 1847.

Protestant Episcopal Tract Society.—A regular meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held at the Church Depository, No. 20 John street, on Tuesday afternoon, the 10th inst., at half-past 5 o'clock, P. M.

D. HUBBEL HOYT, Sec'y.

August 7, 1847.

P. E. Church Missionary Society for Seamen in the City and Port of New York.—A regular meeting of the Board of Managers of this Society will be held in the Sunday School-room of the "Church of the Ascension," on Monday evening next, (9th inst.,) at half-past 7 o'clock.

THOS. P. CUMMINGS, Rec. Sec.

New York, August 7, 1847.

Acknowledgments.

Domestic Missions.—Since his acknowledgment of the 27th July, the Treasurer has received the following contributions:

From St John's, Waterbury, Ct, 50; St John's, Bellefonte, Pa, 4; St James's ch, Phil, 66 04; L, for Domestic Missions, 3; for the Jews, 2—5; St James's, Piqua, O, 10 56; Patapsco Female Institute, 10; Missionary Society of Enquiry, Alexandria Theological Seminary, half, 25; from the estate of the late C D Betts, Esq, a second payment for Domestic Missions, per Rev Dr Anthon, Trustee, 150; offerings of St Mark's in the Bowery, N Y, for May, June, July, and August, 12 12. Total, 332 72.

THOMAS N. STANFORD, Treasurer,
New York, August 3, 1847. 139 Broadway.

Foreign Missions.—Since his report of July 27th, the Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following amounts:—

From Sunday school, St George's ch, Astoria, L I, education of John W Brown, Africa, 20; W G Ridgley and family, Georgetown, D C, annual subscription, for education, China, 50; Missionary Society of Enquiry, Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va, 25; through E Wilcox, R A, Phil, Miss B U, Ch of the Ascension, 1; Young Ladies' Bible Class, St Luke's ch, 2 38; St James's ch, Phil, 64 79; do, for Constantinople, 5—73 17; a friend, Rochester, W N Y, for Africa, 1. Total, 169 17.

J. SMYTH ROGERS, Treasurer,
281 Broadway.

New York, August 3, 1847.

New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society.—The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums,

From W S Faitoute, Esq, one of the executors of the estate of Hanford Smith, Esq, of Newark, the proportion of annual income agreeably to the will of the testatory, 182 20; from the weekly offerings of St Paul's ch, Sing Sing, Rev Charles Tomes, rector, 10; John H Ruckle, 2; B, 8—annual subscribers—10; a friend, by Messrs. Stanford & Swords, donation, 5. Total amount, $207 20.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS C BUTLER, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.

New York, August 3, 1847.

Protestant Episcopal Tract Society.—The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, viz:—

From John H Ruckle, 2; B, 4—annual subscribers—6.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS C. BUTLER, Teasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street

New York, August 3, 1847.

Missionary Committee of the Diocese of New York—The Treasurer has received since his report of 13th ult., the following contributions, viz:—

From St Stephen's ch, New York, Rev J H Price, 12; Trinity ch, Fishkill, Rev Dr Cruse, 15 35; Zion ch, Butternuts, Rev Amos B Beach, 7 38; Church of St John the Evangelist, Stockport, Rev Henry Townsend, 5; Ascension ch, Esopus, Rev J J Bowden, 5; St Paul's ch, Tompkinsville, Rev Gordon Winslow, 6; St Anna's ch, Fishkill Landing, Rev Dr Robertson, 14 80. Total amount, $65 53.

C. N. S. ROWLAND, Treasurer,
August 3, 1847. 55 Water street.

Fund for Aged and Infirm Clergymen.—The Treasurer of the Convention has received for the "Fund for Aged and Infirm Clergymen," since his acknowledgment of 25th May, the following contributions, viz:

From St John's ch, Johnstown, Rev Charles Jones, 6 44; Christ ch, New York, Rev Dr Lyell, 14 86; Zion ch, Butternuts, Rev Amos B Beach, 4 62; St Paul's ch, Tompkinsville, Rev Gordon Winslow, 4. Total amount, $29 92.

C. N. S. ROWLAND,
Treasurer of the Convention P E Church, N Y,
August 3, 1847. 55 Water street.

Education Fund of the Diocese.—Since his acknowledgment of the 9th of June, the subscriber has received the following contributions in aid of the above fund, viz:—

From St Stephen's ch, New York, Rev Dr Price, 10; Zion ch, New York, Rev Mr Cox, 11 50; Grace ch, New York, Rev Dr Taylor, 27; St John's ch, Johnstown, Rev Charles Jones, 1 04; Trinity ch, New Rochelle, Rev Dr Coit, 18 50; Zion ch, Butternuts, Otsego co, Rev A B Beach, 6; Church of St John the Evangelist, Stockport, Rev H Townsend, 3; St George's ch, Newburgh, Rev Dr Brown, 12; St Ann's ch, Fishkill Landing, Rev Dr Robertson, 6 56; St Paul's ch, Glen Cove, Rev W A Jenks, 5. Total, 100 60.

JAMES F. DEPEYSTER, Treasurer,
New York, August 4, 1847. 129 Front st.

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges the receipt of Books of Instruction from the S S Union, in value about ten dollars, for this Mission.

JAMES LLOYD BRECK,
for the Nashotah Mission.

Nashotah-lakes, W. T., 20th July, 1847.

We have pleasure in acknowledging the further sum of *five dollars* in aid of the distressed parishioners of Donerville, Ireland. The contributor is respectfully informed that it will be included in a second remittance to the Rev. Mr. Somerville, the Rector of the Parish, intended to be made early in the present month.

To Correspondents.

"VINDICATOR," in our next. We shall keep the writer to his promise.

Received, "North," "High Churchman," and a letter in vindication of the late President of Kemper College, &c.

Clerical Changes.

The Rev. Jno. B. T. Smith having removed from Drummondtown, Accomack co., Va., and assumed the Rectorship of St. Stephen's Church, Eutaw, Greene co., Alabama, requests all letters for him to be addressed accordingly.

The Rev. Wm. F. Bryant, having taken charge of the church in Middletown, Va., desires all letters and papers to be directed to him at Newtown, Frederick co., Va.

The Rev. Edward De Zeng having accepted a call to the Rectorship of St. Thomas's Church, Hamilton, Madison county, requests his letters and papers addressed accordingly.

The Rev. Hanson T. Wilcoxon to St. Andrew's Church, Clear Spring, Washington county, Md. Address accordingly.

The Rev. Albert C. Patterson has resigned the office of Assistant Minister of St. Matthew's Church, Jersey City; and has become the Rector of Grace Church, Van Vorst, Hudson county.

The Rev. Charles H. Aldis, (of the diocese of New York,) has become the Assistant Minister of St. Matthew's Church, Jersey City.

The Rev. William B. Otis has resigned the Rectorship of St. John's Church, Salem; and been elected Rector of Trinity Church, Moorestown.

The Rev. William Staunton has resigned the Rectorship of St. Peter's Church, Morristown.

The Rev. J. J. Brandegee, (of the diocese of Connecticut,) has been elected Rector of St. Peter's Church, Morristown.

The Rev. W. F. Bryant having taken charge of the church in Middletown, Va, wishes his letters and papers to be directed to Newtown, Frederick co., Va.

Married.

On Tuesday, the 3d inst., at St. John's Church, by Rev. Ralph Hoyt, Rector of the Church of the Good Shepherd, HENRY J. MCKINLEY, Esq., to Miss CHARLOTTE CARDELL, both of this city.

Died,

On the 30th ult., JOHN DEHON, eldest son of Thomas B. and Elmira H. Coddington, aged six years and twenty-nine days. This is the third son those afflicted parents have lost within about a month, by that terrific disease, the Scarlet Fever. We cannot but give renewed expression to our feelings of sympathy and condolence with them, and offer sincere prayer, that God will enable them by his grace to bear up under these repeated strokes of his afflictive providence.

At Unadilla, on Tuesday morning, the 27th inst., Col. GEORGE H. NOBLE, in the 44th year of his age.

Calendar.

AUGUST.

8. Tenth Sunday after Trinity.
15 Eleventh Sunday after Trinity.
22. Twelfth Sunday after Trinity.
24. St. Bartholomew the Apostle.
29. Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity.

SEPTEMBER.

5. Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity.
12 Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity.
15. Ember Day.
17. Ember Day.
18. Ember Day.
19. Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity.
21. St. Matthew the Apostle.
26. Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity.
29. St. Michael and All Angels.

Advertisements.

STANFORD AND SWORDS,
No. 139 Broadway, New York.

In Press.

Happiness of the Blessed, by Richard Mant, D. D., Bishop of Down and Connor, Ireland. One duodecimo volume.

By the same author—Horæ Liturgicæ. Adapted to the American Church, by Rev. W. D. Wilson. In one handsome volume. 12mo.

Edited by the Bishop of Vermont—Grier's Reply to Milner's End of Controversy. One volume duodecimo.

Mercy to Babes: A Plea for the Christian Baptism of Infants. By the Rev. Wm. Adams, S. T. P., a Presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Wisconsin. One volume. 12mo.

Edited by the Rev. W. D Wilson—Sparrow's Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer. One volume. 12mo.

Lessons of the Church, selected from the Holy Scriptures, for the Sundays and Holy Days throughout the year. Handsome 18mo. Large type.

The Vast Army. An Allegory. By the Rev. Edward Monro, Author of the "Dark River," &c. &c. A handsome 18mo.

Agnes Morton, or, the Idolatry of the Heart. By the author of "Bread of Deceit."

Dora Melder: A Story of Alsace. By the Rev. Charles B. Tayler, Author of "Lady Mary," "Margaret," &c. &c. &c. A handsome duodecimo.

Stanford & Swords have recently published, in a thick pamphlet, octavo, a Catalogue of their stock of Theological Works, embracing by far the largest collection for sale in this country. The Catalogue may be had on application gratis. or will be sent by mail to any desiring it.

August 7—1t

EDUCATION.

A YOUNG MAN, who has for some time taught a select school, is desirous of obtaining a situation as tutor in a private family. In addition to the ordinary English branches, he will, if desired, give instructions in the Latin, Greek, and French languages.

Ample references will be given if wished.

Please communicate with the Rev. Benjamin Evans, Rector of the Church of the Holy Evangelists, New York city. August 7—4t

WANTED, a situation as Governess, in a respectable Episcopal family, by a young lady competent to teach the different branches of an English education, as well as the French language, and the Piano Forte. Apply at this office, where satisfactory references will be given. Aug. 7—4t.

FAMILY SCHOOL

THE Subscriber having two daughters of his own to educate, would be happy to receive into his family as Boarders, six or eight little girls, not exceeding twelve years of age, to be associated with them. Every attention will be paid to their moral and religious training according to the principles of the Church, and to their thorough instruction in the ordinary branches of an English Education, in Music, Drawing, French, &c., the elements of Botany, and such other branches of natural science as may be suited to their age and progress. The Young Ladies will be under the constant care and instruction of a competent Governess. The situation is about one mile from Newark, N. J. on the Bellville Road, and is reputed to be unusually healthy. The garden and play grounds are of a delightful description. The place may be reached from New York in forty minutes. For further information as to terms, &c., application may be made to Mr. Floyd Smith, No. 12 John street.

DAVID BROWN,
June 5—tf. Presbyter of the Church.

CUTTER'S ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY.

THIS WORK of 342 pages, by Calvin Cutter, M.D., has passed through seven editions of three thousand each in less than two years. It is used in most of the academies and select schools of New England and New York. It embraces—1st, Anatomy—a description of the Human System, illustrated by more than 200 engravings. 2d, Physiology—a description of the use of the several parts. 3d, Hygiene—rules for the preservation of health. 4th, Directions for the proper treatment of accidents—as the recovery of persons apparently drowned, arresting hemorrhage from divided blood vessels, &c.; making it a valuable work for families as well as schools. For sale by

CLARK & AUSTIN, 205 Broadway,
July 31—4t and the Booksellers generally.

WANTED.

AN EXPERIENCED FEMALE TEACHER, a communicant of the Church, to assist a clergyman in the charge of a select school for young ladies. A knowledge of French and Drawing is required. The best of references will be expected. Address S. M. H., at the office of the Churchman. July 31—tf

For the Churchman.

TRACTS FOR THE SEASONS.

NO. CXXX.

The humiliating truth of human depravity lies at the foundation of the whole Gospel scheme. To be thoroughly persuaded of it as a fact, is therefore necessary to a just appreciation of our personal interest in that scheme; and the beneficial practical influence of this, will be furthered by duly considering the revealed account of the origin of this depravity; while the provided remedy is a topic which cannot be reasonably regarded otherwise than with the most heartfelt solicitude.

Proofs of human depravity it can hardly be necessary to adduce. That man was created to promote the honor and glory of his Maker, may be safely regarded as self-evident. But how has he, left to the keeping and guidance of his natural understanding, even with all the improvements in morals and intelligence to which it is capable of attaining, acted out this obvious principle of his nature? Contenders for the sufficiency of human reason, and the native purity and dignity of human nature, should mark well the answer in man's worship of the celestial luminaries, of fellow men deceased, of beasts and reptiles, and of graven images; in the impure rites of heathen worship, consecrating enormities too gross to be imagined without detestation; in the cruel superstition, which, seeking to appease the wrath of heaven by the blood of fellow men, immolated thousands of human victims on the altars of imagined Gods, and added weight to the estimated importance of the sacrifice, in proportion to the nearness of connexion between the unhappy victim and him by whose hands his blood was shed; and in the wretched fanaticism which thought it saw acceptable atonement in self-inflicted tortures and death. But why speak of things that *were*? the same things *are*, even now, where the human mind is not under the influence of the guidance and discipline of the Bible. These things show what has been, what is, what ever must be, where reason is an unassisted and undirected teacher. They clearly prove the native degeneracy of man.

And so strong is this, that it breaks the yoke and bursts the bonds, and so wilful that it runs far astray from the hallowed guidance, which the blessed Gospel provides for our unspeakable good, even where that Gospel is fully known, and is, on all sides, urging its benefits upon us. Hence the infidelity which, proudly rejecting the Gospel, stands convicted, by all truly reasonable views of man's nature and history, as, in itself, and besides its generally connected vices and abominations, the height of wickedness and immorality, a glaring proof of depravity and profligacy. But even with professing Christians, how mournfully is their religion deprived, by their own wilful folly, of its good influences on their characters and lives! How is the name of God blasphemed among them! How is His worship neglected! How are business, and pleasure, and the love of money, allowed to lure to that affection and devotion which His word declares to partake largely of the guilt of idolatry! And when the outward forms of His service are adopted, with what coldness and want of interest is this done! With what unholy dispositions, and cherished worldly affections, is it connected! How do arrant hypocrites and mere formalists mingle with the honest and the true! Worldly business or pleasure presents its claims, so do the duties of religion: difficulties and hindrances are to be encountered, and sacrifices made, in each case: in which direction do willingness, and inclination, and desire, most readily turn? In which are efforts most readily bestowed?

Surely the real character and history of man, as related to his Maker, sadly but incontestably proves the humiliating fact of his inherent depravity?

Man is also by nature a social being. His character as such opens some of the chief sources of his happiness. The principle thus embraced is exceeded by none in the variety and deep interest of practical application to which it calls. And surely our Beneficent Creator must have designed that it should be improved to the cherishing of virtuous sympathies, friendly and affectionate regards, kind consideration of each other's interests and feelings, active benevolence, and fidelity to every department of relative duty. But what do history and fact say of man as a social being? Ambition, proud in its bearing, cruel and overweening in its purposes, and reckless in its deeds, tramples on all of virtue, of right, and even of liberty and life, which may oppose its career. Iron despotism sports with human welfare, and stains with blood the records of the age. At the shrine of false honor, a Moloch delighting in human sacrifices, the arm of vengeance strikes the fatal blow into a brother's heart. Wrong dealing stalks abroad—here committing its spoliations with open violent assault; there with concealment and disguise; and there with still more studied artfiice and fraud. Hard heartedness or insensibility steels the soul against benevolence and pity. Envy fixes its malignant fang into its victim, and calumny maligns the excellence it cannot reach. On all sides, ungovernable tempers, bad passions, suspicions, jealousies, feuds, and contests, embitter social intercourse, sever natural ties, burst affection's bonds, and render the social principle, mercifully designed for our welfare and happiness, a dreadful curse. Whence all this, but from the rooted depravity of man?

Is man a rational and immortal being, capable of virtue, and of moral excellence and advancement? Then surely it is his natural obligation to improve his intellect, duly to exercise his moral faculties and powers, and to give himself to preparation for a happy and virtuous immortality. But when we look around, and when we look within, does the obvious view afforded of character and conduct, prove that men generally thus act the reasonable part? Alas, the sad reverse! Passions and appetites bear sway; reason bends beneath their sceptre; the understanding is blinded and besotted by their influence; and the will follows at their beck. Awfully dark is the catalogue of iniquities and crimes which, hence proceeding, hardly allow a bound to be placed to the estimate of human depravity. Before we reach its depths, we find man sunk into the brute. As we range through the disgusting length and breadth of its influence, we see the vilest tempers and affections destroying individual and social welfare; impurities fixing the foulest stains on hearts which God made for holiness and virtue, and which, in baptism, were consecrated as temples of the Holy Ghost; the exalted gift of speech perverted to the basest purposes; a worldly spirit deadening all devotion, and alienating the affections from Him who justly claims and merits them; man's best interests neglected and despised; and that deplorable hardihood cherished which, for a few fleeting pleasures, bends its steady course towards regions of irremediable wo.

Whose experience and observation do not contribute to the most mournful filling up of the outlines now presented of the proofs of human depravity? Who *feels* not that *he* is one of a fallen, polluted, and guilty race?

And when we look abroad upon the world, and the operations of nature, do they indicate the dealings of Providence with an innocent and upright race of men? Blasting and mildew defeat the labors of the husbandman. Famine and pestilence spread wide the work of death. Angry tempests bring desolation over the face of nature, and open, in the abyss of mighty waters, untimely graves for myriads. Lightning strikes with immediate destruction. Earthquakes rock the globe and cleave its surface for the instant inhumation of living thousands.

Not so surely was this world formed by a God who delights in the happiness of His creatures. These are indications of the wrath of God revealed from heaven against the unrighteousness and ungodliness of men. They are tremendous attestations to the truth of human depravity and guilt.

Every one possessing an honest and enlightened conscience, knows and feels that his personal share of this depravity and guilt is not merely unavoidable frailty. He is self-convicted of *wilful* sin, and of total deficiency in claim to divine mercy and compassion. The very best know that they have been sadly guilty of failure in pains to learn, and heartiness and diligence to obey, the will of God, and of stifling emotions to goodness, resisting checks of conscience, and violating their own sense of duty.

That God did not create man the corrupt and depraved being that he now is, must be obvious on every reasonable and enlightened view of the subject. What end could the infinitely perfect God propose to Himself in the forming and peopling of a world, but the exercise and manifestation of His goodness, and the promotion of His glory? The only creature of earth with qualities fitting him for the exalted service, must have been designed to set forth, by the due exercise of his intellectual and moral powers, and the due improvement of his spiritual nature, the glory of the Great Creator of all things. But how far removed is man from meetness for so high and holy a distinction! A sad change must have come over the human character and condition. Whence this? And how are its consequences to be checked, and ultimately surmounted? Unaided human reason is here totally at a loss: it knows nothing: it can discover nothing. It sees that such *are* man's state and nature; and there is stopped by its own impotency. Revelation interposes. False philosophy affects to set this aside; but it has no substitute to propose. *True* philosophy, however, gives quite a different judgment, and accords to revelation the credit of furnishing the only satisfactory account of the unquestionable fact of man's depravity, of its remedy, and of means for deliverance from its effects.

And surely nothing can be more consonant with the nature of both God and man, than the Scripture account of man's fall from original uprightness. It represents the Deity as, after the formation of this world, the enriching of it with the various productions of the vegetable kingdom, and the placing therein of the lower orders of animals, completing His design by the mysterious creation of a being uniting in his person the nature of the angelic hosts who, long ere time began, had been the ministers of His heavenly courts, with that of the recently formed earthly animals; with a body made of the ground on which he was placed, and a soul breathed into him of the breath of God Himself—immortal, intelligent, and with perfect faculties. He was to be at the height of sublunary excellence, the most exalted specimen of the power of God in this lower world. Though an inhabitant of earth, sharing it with the inferior animals, he was to hold converse with heaven, and commune with the glorious Creator of them all; in the purity of whose love and service he was to enjoy the bliss of an earthly paradise, till taken to his celestial home.

But this love and service were to be those of an intelligent moral agent, and therefore not of constraint, but of free will. As a test of his sincerity, and grateful fidelity, God was pleased to lay a prohibition on the use of the fruit of one of the beautiful and inviting trees of the garden in which man was placed; saying of that tree, "Thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Thus, in a way as simple, and as favorable to him as we can imagine, was man to prove that his obedience and devotion were willing, and that his heart would not be drawn from his Maker. But alas for the result! It is revealed, with tremendous emphasis, in the proofs that we see and feel of human depravity. Man forgot his Maker's goodness; disregarded the exalted dignity of his nature; wilfully closed his eyes to his own happiness; yielded to the temptation of the devil, disobeyed, rebelled, fell from his glorious first estate. It matters not in what his offence consisted. The law of Heaven, which invests with all the sacredness and strength of moral obligation whatever, in the sovereign will of its Author, may be included in its requisitions, was broken; and consequently the tie of innocence and virtue, which bound man to his native perfections, was dissolved; his whole nature became radically changed; and the dread penalty, Thou shalt surely die, was incurred.

But changed as thus was man, He who is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, changed not. For though his truth and justice remained, and ever must remain, inviolate, yet His loving kindness was still a part of His perfection. Although, therefore, the threat had gone forth, and His truth was pledged for its execution, and His justice demanded it; yet mercy pleaded for the trembling convict; and he was still beloved of God. Can he then be spared? Can mercy triumph, and justice still remain to preserve the full harmony of the divine attributes? Yes: a Mediator interposes. He will stand between the sinner and the offended justice of his God. He is such a Mediator as will make the mediation a perfect work. He will bring merit as a price equal to the mercy sought. He will bring ability and power sufficient to carry Him through the hardest of the work to be undertaken. For He is Very God of Very God, That Person in the Holy and Undivided Trinity, who, from all eternity, was begotten of the Father. He will so condescend, in His infinite mercy, as, passing by the nature of angels, to take upon Him the nature of the fallen beings whom He would redeem, and thus, as Man, suffer for guilty man. He will bring to this work of profound condescension and infinite compassion, the ability of His Godhead to carry Him through all that the demands of divine holiness and justice require, and the perfection of His Godhead to give infinite merit to His mediation.

The love of God having prompted His acceptance of this offer of mediating mercy, its benefits were forthwith vouchsafed. Man was spared. The execution of the threat of death was delayed; and the guilty being against whom it had been pronounced was, for this mediation's sake, again put upon his trial for heaven, with grace provided to enable him to pass the trial successfully, and with his Mediator's merits to cover the utter want of merit in his services. Thus was a redeemed state established for the apostate parents of our race, and their descendants. The fall left them sore let and hindered indeed in their probation; but redemption raised them to an ability for successfully passing that probation.

At the time which God saw to be the fittest, the Mediator came on earth for His mysterious work of mercy, and took the human into union with the divine nature. All that is recorded in the New Testament of the Man Christ Jesus, was done, and said, and suffered, in His capacity as Mediator; and this mysterious plan of mercy opens the only way for the rescue of guilty man from the sad consequences of his inherent depravity and actual sins, and for his advancement, through holiness here, to the perfection of his nature hereafter. It is the only means to which the sinner can look for the reconciliation of his offended God. Let him look to it with the lively faith which centres therein all his dependence, and sincerely and earnestly seeks the blessings thus placed within his reach.

The melancholy truths, obvious to every reflecting mind, of the general depravity and corruption of our nature, and each one's personal guilt and danger, clearly prove that the only religion fit for man is that which takes him as he is, and not misguiding him by vaunting the dignity and perfection of his nature, lays at its foundation the truth, sustained by such a melancholy array of evidence, that he is a fallen and guilty being, having nothing in himself to encourage hope or procure relief. In religion, as in philosophy, it is mere sophistry to found our ideas on abstract reasonings and theories respecting what might be, or what it is thought should be; and that is the only reasonable and right, and therefore the only truly philosophical, course, which builds on clearly established and indubitable truths. Hence the only truly reasonable religion, the only one adapted to man's safe guidance, comfort, and welfare, is the Gospel, which takes him in his depraved, guilty, and hopeless state, and brings him effectual means of relief. That these means, however, may be successful, the truth of our depravity and guilt should come home to our individual consciences. We must feel ourselves to be lost and undone forever without the interposition of God's grace and mercy in Jesus Christ; and so appreciate that interposition, as one perishing in the deep or in the flames would his only hope and means of escape. Renouncing all self-dependence, we should cast ourselves unreservedly, and in the true faith and devotion of the Gospel, on our Saviour. The power of His grace will then appear in delivering us from the bondage of corruption, subduing our evil propensities, and carrying us forward to that glorious consummation where we shall be more than restored to the original uprightness of our nature, and be made like the angels in heaven. Otherwise—if by impenitence and unfaithfulness, we slight the Redeemer's mercy, and neglect the appointed means of restoration from the effects of our depravity and guilt—these must be expected to take their natural course—the farther and still farther estrangement of the heart and life from God, and their gradually increasing subjection to the dominion of the infernal author of all ill; until he reward his votaries by taking them to himself, and making them partakers of the supreme and everlasting wretchedness to which he is consigned by the just judgment of Heaven.

B. T. O.

From the English Churchman.

NATIONAL EDUCATION.

The Lord Bishop of Lincoln has issued the following letter to the Clergy of this Diocese:—

In the Charge which I delivered at the Trienial Visitation, held in 1840, I offered some remarks on the relation in which the Clergy stand to the younger portion of their flocks, and especially to the children of the poor. The question of National Education then occupied a large share of public attention; and my remarks were particularly directed to a scheme, which had found many advocates, for separating secular from religious instruction; for supplying the former at the expense of the State, and leaving the latter to be provided by the parents themselves. That scheme has since been abandoned: but the clamour, which has been raised against the Minutes recently issued by the Committee of Privy Council, having again drawn the public attention to the subject of National Education, I am induced briefly to lay before you my view of the propable effect of the issuing of those minutes, and of the additional responsibility which it will impose on the parochial Clergy.

The opponents of the measure proposed by the Committee of Privy Council object to all interference on the part of Government with the education of the people. The objection is not new. Amongst the numerous tracts which proceeded from the pen of the late Dr. Priestly is one, in which he deprecates all such interference, for the reasons which are now urged—that it is dangerous to public liberty, and likely to place too great power in the hands of the Established Church. It cannot, I think, be denied, that the tendency of the recent measures is ultimately to bring the education, of the poorer classes at least, entirely under the control of the Government. But, if the poor are to be educated at all, I see not how this consequence is to be avoided. Experience has shown that the system of voluntary contributions is insufficient to the accomplishment of the objects. In some parishes, in which the landed proprietors are duly impressed with a sense of the responsibility attaching to their position in society, and are disposed cordially to co-operate with the Minister in his endeavours to ameliorate the moral aud religious condition of the poor, schools have been established without any assistance from the Committee of Council, and are maintained partly by voluntary subscriptions, partly by the small payments made by the parents of the children. But in the case of the majority of schools existing in our rural districts, the buildings could not have been completed without a grant from the Committee of Council: and now that they are completed, the greatest difficulty is often experienced in raising the funds necessary for the payment of a master or mistress; to say nothing of the defective character of the instruction given in the schools, in consequence of the impossibility of offering such stipends as will secure the services of persons duly qualified for the office of teaching. If, then, the poor are to be educated, grants must be made by the State for the purpose; and the only question is, on what principle are those grants to be distributed?

It has been contended that they ought to be placed at the disposal of the Church, inasmuch as it is the divinely appointed instructor of the people; and, if we turn to the Canons of 1603, we shall be satisfied that the framers of those Canons meant to place the education of the people under the supervision of the Church. By the 77th Canon the licence of the Bishop is required, before any person can teach either in a public or a private school; and this licence is not to be granted, until proof has been obtained, not only of the applicant's competency to teach, and of the purity of his moral character, but also of the soundness of his doctrine. In the 78th Canon a preference is given to the Curate of the parish, in case he is able and willing to undertake the office of schoolmaster; and in the 79th it is directed that the schoolmaster shall instruct the children, committed to his charge, in the catechism; shall cause them to hear sermons; shall ascertain, by examination, how far they have profited by what they have heard; and shall train them in the knowledge of the Scrtptures; the only direction given, with reference to secular instruction, being, that the children shall be taught the grammar set forth by King Henry the Eighth.

At the time when the Canons were framed, all the inhabitants of the land were, or were supposed to be, members of the Church. The existence of persons dissenting from it, if recognized by law, was recognized only in order to subject them to civil penalties. Bu in the interval between the date of the Canons and the year 1833, when, for the first time, the legislature made a grant of public money for the purposes of education, the religious aspect of the country had undergone an important change. The law no longer regards all the people of the land as members of the Church; it recognizes the existence of other religious communities, which it protects in the exercise of their worship, and in the establishment of schools for the education of the younger portion of their members. The Canons of 1603 were framed on the supposition that the members of the Church and State were identical; but the supposition being no longer (it never was altogether) agreeable to fact, the education of the people can no longer be placed exclusively under the supervision of the Church. They who dissent from it say to the Legislature, "You have not only given us a legal existence; you have not only insured to us protection in our lives and properties, and the free exercise of our religious worship, but you have recognised also our claim to participate in all the civil rights and privileges of the subjects of the realm. In that character we contribute towards the taxes raised to defray the expenses of civil government; and if a portion of the funds, so raised, is to be applied to the purposes of National Education, we claim our share in it." I am aware that the validity of this plea has been contested. It has been urged that it is one thing to allow perfect freedom of religious opinion, another to give direct encouragement to dissent, by supplying funds for the education of the rising generation in its principles; that the latter course is incompatible with the maintenance of an Established Church. But it is now useless to enter into the discussion of this question. The Government, in 1833, determined it, by assigning one half of the grant, then voted, to the National Society, as the representative of the Church; the other half to the British and Foreign School Society, as the representative of the dissenting communities. From that time to the present the grants made for the purposes of education have been distributed on the same principle. The formation of the Committee of Privy Council made no change in this respect. The conditions on which the grants are made have undergone some alteration; but the principle of distribuiton remains unaltered. The recent Minutes of Council, which have given rise to so much angry discussion, do not affect it.

Having once determined to make grants to the dissenting communities, as well as to the Church, the Government appears to me to have adopted the only practicable mode of applying them. The attempt to establish a system of combined education, under which the children of the parents of all religious denominations were to be educated together, could only originate in utter ignorance of the state of religious feeling in the country. Under such a system either religious instruction must be altogether excluded, or a distinction, very difficult to be observed in practice, must be drawn between general and special religious instruction; the former to be given in the school, the latter by the parents and the Ministers of the several communities to which they belong. The people of this country have not yet arrived at that state of indifference, as to religious doctrines, which will render the adoption of such a system practicable. Far from tending to produce religious peace, as its promoters profess to hope, it would give rise to increased jealousies between the Ministers of different denominations Each would feel himself called to labour with tenfold diligence in communicating special religious instruction to the younger members of his flock; a species of rivalry would be excited, and the points of difference, instead of being thrown into the back ground, would be rendered more distinctly prominent.

I consider, therefore, the plan of National Education adopted by the Government to be the only one which holds out any reasonable prospect of success in the present state of public feeling; and, as I stated in the commencement of this letter, I am desirous of drawing your serious attention to the manner in which the recent measures of the Committee of Privy Council affect the obligations under which you stand to the rising generation. The main design of these measures is, by ameliorating the present condition of the schoolmaster, by giving him a much more respectable position in society, a more adequate present remuneration, and the hope of a provision in old age; to remove that which all must feel to be one of the greatest obstacles in the way of establishing an efficient system of National Education—the want of well-qualified teachers. For detailed information respecting the mode in which the Committee of Privy Council propose to carry out their design, I must refer you to the Minutes themselves, and to the explanation of them, published by authority, under the title of "The School in its relations to the State, the Church, and the Congregation." The point which I wish to press upon your consideration is, that if the object aimed at by the Committee of Privy Council should be attained, and the anticipated improvement in the qualifications of the masters should be realized, that improvement, far from affording you a plea for relaxing your supervision of the school, will demand from you the exercise of increased attention and vigilance. It can scarcely be necessary for me to remark that the greater the amount of knowledge which we communicate to the child, the more we cultivate and sharpen his intellect, the greater hazard we run of rendering him a dangerous, instead of a valuable member of society, unless we, at the same time, secure the application of his intellectual powers and attainments to right purposes. This can only be secured by sound moral and religious training, by impressing his mind with such a conviction as may become the principle influencing his whole conduct—that his present life is only a preparation for another, in which he will be called to render an account of all his actions. To impress and to deepen this conviction is your office; and your responsibility in the fulfilment of that office is increased in proportion to the increased power, which the additional amount of knowledge communicated to the child gives him of becoming an instrument of good or evil. Allow me then to recall to your recollection the following remarks contained in the Charge which I delivered at the Visitation in 1840.

"Whatever be the final determination of the Legislature on this important question (the separation of secular from religious instruction) our course, my Reverend Brethren, is clear. I have already briefly noticed the part which the Church expects her Ministers to bear in the education of the rising generation. She means them to regard themselves as the spiritual parents of every child whom they baptize; as having contracted towards him parental obligations; as having pledged themselves to train him up in the fulfilment of his baptismal vows. He has, through their agency, been born again with water and the Spirit: if, then, they take no care by godly instruction to promote his spiritual growth, how do they differ from the unnatural parent who deserts the infant to which she has given birth? Consider, my Reverend Brethren, the importance of taking advantage of the age of purity and docility, when the soul is yet ready to receive impressions favourable to holiness and goodness; when you have no prejudices to overcome, no habits of evil to subdue. If you allow this precious season to pass unimproved, you will in vain endeavor to recall it. Wait but a short time, and you will find that access to the mind is in a great measure barred against you; that the lessons of piety which you inculcate produce no impression; that you have almost cut yourself off from the possibility of reaping any fruit from your ministerial labours; for, to little purpose do you preach to the man, if you have allowed the child to grow up in ignorance. Consider too, that children, as they are the most interesting, are also the most important portion of your flock; that they will become parents in turn, and that on them must, in the ordinary course of God's providence, depend the moral character of their offspring. If you labour to instil good principles into them, and the Divine blessing attends your labours, you will ensure a succession of generations, all walking in the ways and the commandments of God. If you neglect your trust, if you take no pains to instruct the children whom the Church commits to your care, in their Christian duties, they will assuredly grow up in the practice of evil themselves, and will, through their offspring, perpetuate vice and misery."

"Viewed with reference to the moral and religious character of the rising generation, the schoolroom is scarcely a less essential part of the Parochial Establishment than the House of God itself. The lessons inculcated in it may exercise a no less powerful and permanent influence on the future behaviour of the child: may contribute no less effectually towards his training for eternity. The Clergy, therefore, if they wish to fulfil their duty towards this most interesting portion of their flock, will be constant in their attendance at the school, and will watch with unceasing vigilance over the instruction communicated in it. I am not insensible to the difficulties with which, in purely agricultural districts, they have to contend. The scantiness of the population and the wide extent over which that population is scattered,—the early age at which the labour of the child becomes valuable to the parent, and the consequent inducement to withdraw him from the school before he has acquired a moderate portion even of elementary learning, or formed any habits of docility, industry, and good order—the indifference of too many parents to the moral and religious culture of their children, arising from inadequate notions of parental responsibility, and, strange to say, not unfrequently justified by the plea of religion—on the ground that, the conversion of the child to God being the work of the Holy Spirit, it will take place in His good time, and that any interference on the part of man, by attempting to instil religious principles is useless, if not presumptuous; these are difficulties with which you will have to contend in your own endeavours to form efficient schools. The first may be obviated by establishing a common school for three or four contiguous parishes. The Committee of Council are endeavouring to obviate, partially at least, the second, by establishing a system of apprenticeship, which will operate as an inducement to parents to allow their children to remain longer in the school, by holding out the prospect that they may in due time be provided for, either as National Schoolmasters, or in some department of the public service. The last difficulty it is your peculiar province to remove by personal communication with the parents, by awakening them to a sense of the responsibility attaching to the parental character, and of the heinousness of their offence in not only neglecting the moral training of their offspring, but in perverting religion into an excuse for their neglect. It is the more incumbent upon us to labour assiduously in this department of ministerial duty, because it is to be feared that the erroneous notions entertained, the indifference and apathy exhibited, by parents on this most important subject, are partly, at least, traceable to our own neglect. We have not availed ourselves of the opportunities afforded us of forcing it upon their notice. We have allowed the public catechizing of children and the public administrations of baptism to fall comparatively into disuse. On the latter point, I trust that a great improvement is gradually taking place, and that the practice of baptizing privately, excepting in cases of necessity, is becoming continually less common. But on the former, I fear that a comparison of the present state of things even with that which existed a century ago (a time at which it is now the fashion to represent the Church as sunk in lethargy) would not prove very satisfactory. I have now lying before me a book at the date of 1738, containing the results of an inquiry instituted by the Bishop who then presided over the Diocese, from which it appears that the practice of catechising was almost universal. That the interests of religion have suffered materially by its discontinuance cannot be doubted. Travellers concur in bearing testimony to the zeal and ability with which the Clergy in Roman Catholic countries discharge this part of their duty, and to the influence which they in consequence obtain over the rising generation: why should not the same beneficial consequence flow from the revival of the practice among ourselves?

Still retaining the opinion which I expressed in 1840, *that the very existence of the Established Church rests upon the success of the efforts which she may make, under Divine Grace, to instruct the rising generation in her religious principles*, I have felt it my duty to call your attention to the additional impulse likely to be given to National Education by the measures proposed in the late Minutes of the Committee of Council, and to the additional responsibility in consequence imposed on you, to whom is committed by the Church the important trust of training the children of its members in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. I doubt not that the subject has frequently occupied your thoughts: and if the effect of the foregoing remarks shall, under God's blessing, be, either to place the importance of the duty in a clear point of view, or to render you any assistance in fulfiling it, my object in addressing you will be attained.

Advertisements.

RYDAL MOUNT SEMINARY FOR BOYS,

CHARLESTOWN, MASS.

FEW of the delightful mansions for which the vicinity of Boston is distinguished, are possessed of more attractions than the one which has been secured for this Institution. It is distant but ten minutes' walk from the central part of the City of Boston, whilst the extensive grounds around it, abounding in fruit and shade trees, impart to it the united charms of elegance and seclusion.

The course of instruction will include every branch which pertains to an accomplished education. Special attention will be given to the formation of manners, which are the result of habits rather than precepts. The pupils, with their Teachers, are regular attendants at St. John's Church, (Episcopal.)

The health of the pupils is most carefully attended to—the regular exercise—the abundant and wholesome food—and the salubrious situation of the School, are the main causes which conduce to this end, and are found so effectual that the advice of a physician is scarcely ever required. The INSTITUTION is abundantly furnished with all "appliances and means" which may conduce to the amusement and recreation of the boys, out of school hours Gymnastics, Gardening, &c. &c., form a portion of their more atheletic occupations; while for stormy weather, and in-door amusements, every facility is offered for making the time pass in such a manner as to keep the powers of the body and mind in constant and healthy exercise. The whole establishment is made to resemble, as nearly as possible, a large, well regulated family.

Pupils are received at any age over eight years. It is preferred to have them sent at as early an age as convenient, in order that they may receive the full benefit of the course of instruction and moral training pursued in this establishment.

Boarding and tuition in the English branches and the Classics, per year, $200.

A long list of References, of the highest respectability, in Boston and the vicinity, may be seen by any who are disposed to patronize the School.

Circulars may be seen at the office of The Churchman.

T. B. CLOUGH, *Principal.*
E. W. ABBOTT, *Superintendant.*
Rev. WM. WITHINGTON, *Teacher of the Classics.*
F. B. CASAS, *Teacher of Spanish.*
A. AURAY, *Teacher of French and Drawing.*
Mrs. LOUISA PATTERSON, *Matron.*

June 26—3m

CHURCH CUSHIONS, PULPIT FURNITURE, &c.

THE subscribers would respectfullly inform Building Committees and members of churches that they are prepared to execute orders for Cushions, Lining and Stuffing of Pews, Benches, and making Furniture for, and Trimmings of, Pulpits and Desks, of every kind of material used for the purpose, of different styles, at moderate prices, and at the shortest notice.

W. & G. CURTIS, Upholsterers in general,
aug. 3—y 449 Broadway.

BOOKBINDING.

THE Subscriber respectfully informs the public tha he continues to carry on the above business in all its branches. All orders punctually attended to.

Reference is made to the following gentlemen—Messrs Stanford & Swords, at whose store orders may be left Rev. Drs. Seabury, Anthon, Taylor, Higbee, and Smith J. M. Wainwright, W. A. Muhlenberg, John S. Rogers, Esq., 194 Fulton.

September 5—yly WILLIAM ASHKETTLE.

CHURCH SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES,

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE PASTOR OF THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY COMMUNION.

Miss AYRES, Principal.

No. 54 West Twentieth street, New York.

THE Fall Term of this Institution will commence on the 15th of September. A Prospectus of the School may be obtained of the Rev. W. A. Muhlenberg, D. D., No. 110 Twentieth street; of Messrs. Stanford & Swords, No. 139 Broadway; and at the Depository of the Sunday School Union, No. 20 John street.

REFERENCES.

L. M. Hoffman, Esq., J. H. Swift, Esq., W. F. Cary, Esq., Govr. M. Wilkins, Esq., W. H. Aspinwall, Esq., R. B. Minturn, Esq., Murray Hoffman, Esq., Hamilton Wilkes, Esq. July 17—tf

ORGANS FOR SALE—St. Mark's Church Organ. Inquire of the Sexton, Mr. Disbrow.

Also, three Gothic Organs, just finished.

Two Grecian cased Organs.

A second hand Church Organ, and an assortment of Parlor Organs.

For further particulars inquire of

HENRY ERBEN, 172 Centre street.

July 17—yl.

THE YOUNG CHURCHMANS MISCELLANY. A Journal for the Young, containing religious and instructive matter, and illustrated with choice Engravings, Small 8vo., 42 pp. Edited by Rev. J. A. Spencer, A. M., autho of "The Christian Instructed in the ways of the Gospel and the Church." Published regularly on the first of every month, at 191 Broadway. Price, $1 50 per annum. July 11—yly

☞ At reduced prices for Cash only. ☜

Published and for sale by

THE GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, Depository No. 20 John street, New York:

BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION

Union Primer,	per hundred,	$2 00
Prot. Epis. Sunday School Book, No. 1,	"	1 25
" " " No. 2,	"	1 50
" " " No. 3,	"	1 75
" " " No. 4,	"	3 50
Questions on the Sunday School Books,	"	4 00
Catechism No. 1, (Scripture Catechism,)	"	1 25
Catechism No. 2, (Catechism broken into short questions and answers,)	"	2 00
Catechism No. 3, (Catechism enlarged by Bishop Hobart,) stiff covers,	"	6 00
Catechism No. 4, (Catechism of the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,	"	4 00
Beaven's Help to Catechizing,	"	6 00
Lloyd's Catechism on the Evidences of the Bible,	"	2 50
Church Catechism,	"	1 00
First Truths,	"	2 00
Duty to God,	"	50
Church Primer,	"	1 25
Sunday School Liturgy, and Psalms and Hymns, stiff covers,	"	6 00
Manual of Short Prayers for Children,	"	1 50
Harmony of the Creeds,	"	2 00
Questions on the Book of Common Prayer,	"	2 00
Collects from the Prayer Book,	"	1 50
Questions on the Collects, stiff covers,	"	6 00
Catechism on the Collects,	"	20 00
Epistles and Gospels from the Prayer Book,	"	6 00
Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, Parts 1 and 2, stiff covers	"	8 00
Manual of Oral Instruction upon the Bible,	"	2 00
Easy Questions for a Little Child, with answers in the words of Scripture,	"	2 00
The History of our Blessed Lord, in Easy Verse,	"	6 00
Bible Companion, vol. 1, Old Testament,	"	18 00
" " vol. 2, New "	"	20 00
Quest. on St. Matthew, part 1, stiff cov.,	"	6 00
" " 2, "	"	6 00
" " 3, "	"	6 00
Questions on the Acts, 1, "	"	6 00
" " 2, "	"	6 00
" " 3, "	"	5 00

NEW BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION.

THE CHURCH CATECHISM SIMPLIFIED, *by Questions and Answers*, $3 00.

SCRIPTURE READING LESSONS *for Young children*, $6

☞ A discount of 10 per cent. from the above prices is allowed to Sunday Schools, auxiliary to the Union, and to individuals purchasing to the amount of ten dollars.

LIBRARY BOOKS.

CHEAP LIBRARY. *One Hundred Volumes* bound, with muslin backs, and containing 158 books, put up by direction of the Executive Committee, for TEN DOLLARS This is believed to be the cheapest Library in th country.

THE LIBRARY to this date, in 167 vols., of various prices. Total, $24,44 nett.

THE CHILDREN'S MAGAZINE, bound in 36 vols., of 144 pages each. Price for the set, $6,48 nett.

THE JUVENILE LIBRARY, 6 vols., 32 mo. Price for the set, 87 cents nett.

BEAUTIFUL BOOKS FOR GIFTS.

In quarto form, upon superfine paper.

THE SHADOW OF THE CROSS. An Allegory By the Rev. Wm. Adams. With elegant illustrations. Muslin, gilt, 62 1-2 cents; fancy paper covers, 25 cents.

THE DISTANT HILLS. An Allegory. By the same author. Similarly illustrated. Muslin, gilt, 62 1-2 cts

SACRED ALLEGORIES. The Shadow of the Cross, and The Distant Hills, in 1 vol. Muslin, gilt, $1.

THE DARK RIVER. An Allegory. By the Rev. Edward Munro. With 4 elegant illustrations. Muslin, 62 1-2 cents.

THE HISTORY OF OUR BLESSED LORD. In Easy Verse. With beautiful lithographic illustrations, &c. Muslin 50 cents; fancy paper covers, 31 cents.

THE CASTLE ON THE ROCK. With a fine wood engraving. Muslin, 25 cents, fancy paper covers, 12 1-2 cents.

FIDELIS, THE SOLDIER OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE. An Allegory. With a fine engraving. Fancy paper, 8 cents.

NEW LIBRARY BOOKS.

LUKE SHARP. A Tale of Modern Education,	half morocco,	34 cents
THE DARK RIVER,	"	30 "
THE FALL OF CRŒSUS	"	31 "
THE CRIPPLE OF THE RAILROAD,	"	15 "
THOMAS KENMIR.	"	12 "
GOTTFRIED, or THE ISLAND HERMITAGE,		23 "
THE CASTLE OF FALKENBOURG,	"	15 "
HISTORY OF CHARLES JONES,	"	10 "
PRASCA LOUPOULOFF, or Filial Piety Exemplified,		18 "
BAD HABITS,		10 "

PERIODICAL.

The CHILDREN'S MAGAZINE, *monthly publication*, 24 pages, 18mo—single, 25 cents per annum, and fifty copies for $10—payable always in advance.

☞ Address all orders for books, and all remittances to DANIEL DANA, Jr., Agent,

may 16 Church Depository, 20 John street.

THE MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW YORK.

No. 56 Wall street.

Nett amount of accumulated premiums invested in mortgages and N. Y. State and City Stocks and U. S. Government, $376,282,20.

THIS Company is organized on the purely mutual principle, and its business is restricted by the charter to the insurance of lives, and granting annuities and endowments, and now ranks among the strongest and safest institutions in this country. The whole of the profits nure to the benefit of the policy holders. An extensive and prosperous business promises large dividends on the first division of profits on the 1st February, 1848, and persons now insuring will share in these profits if they survive that period.

The premiums are paid annually, semi-annually, or quarterly, if desired, and are as low as any American Company, and lower than the English, with a participation in the profits. Policy holders are secured by investments in bond and mortgages on real estate in the city of New York and Brooklyn, worth double the amount loaned thereon, and in stocks of the State and city of New York, and of the United States.

The transactions of this Company are on the cash principle; consequently the survivors of parties insuring with it will not be subjected to the heavy drawback of accumulated premium notes, reducing the benefit of the assurance to a small pittance.

Persons may effect insurance on their own lives and the lives of others. A married woman can insure the life of her husband, which will inure to her sole use and that of her children.

Pamphlets explanatory of the principles of Mutual Life Insurance, and illustrating its advantages, with forms of application, may be obtained at the office of the Company, 56 Wall street, or of any of its agents.

TRUSTEES.

Morris Robinson,	Alfred Pell,
William J. Hyslop,	David C. Colden,
R. H. McCurdy,	John C. Thatcher,
Frederick S. Winston,	Rufus L. Lord,
C. W. Faber,	William Betts,
Mortimer Livingston,	Joseph Blunt,
Theodore Sedgwick,	Isaac G. Pearson,
Stacy B. Collins.	William Barnewall,
John H. Swift,	William Moore,
Jos. B. Collins,	Zebedee Cook,
James S. Wadsworth	Jonathan Miller,
Henry W. Hubbell,	Fitz Green Halleck,
Gouverneur M. Wilkins,	Robert Schuyler,
John V. L. Pruyn,	Amos S. Perry,
Frederick Whittlesey,	Joseph Tuckerman,
Charles Ely,	Gidnon Hawley,
John C. Cruger,	Wm. J. Bunker,
Walter Joy,	One vacancy.

MORRIS ROBINSON, President.

SAMUEL HANNAY, Secretary.

MINTURN POST, M.D., Physician to the Com'y.

JOS. BLUNT, Solicitor. 504 Broadway

May 22—tf

MR. YOUNG'S

ENGLISH AND CLASSICAL INSTITUTE,

No. 1 Abingdon Square, corner of Bank st.

THIS School which has for nearly three years been located at No. 88 Fourth street, will be removed on the first of May, to the large and pleasant house, No. 1 Abingdon Square. The rooms will be fitted up and furnished with all the comforts of private parlors.

In addition to a thorough course of English and Classical instruction, the principal modern languages, drawing, vocal music, &c., are taught by competent instructors.

Terms—from $10 to $15 per quarter, without extra charges for any studies. Two or three pupils will be admitted into the Principal's family as boarding scholars, at a charge of $200 per annum, payable quarterly in advance.

Circulars containing particulars, references, &c., may be had till 1st of May at 88 Fourth street.

March 27—tf

BOARDING and Day School for Young Ladies, at West Farms, Westchester county, New York.

The Spring Term will commence on the 12th of April, at which time Mrs. Wilkins will again be ready to receive a limited number of pupils as boarders. Those parents who may favor her with the care of their children may be assured that every attention will be paid to their happiness as well as to their education. The village of West Farms is healthy, and at the convenient distance of eleven miles from New York, from which place it is rendered easy of access by the Harlem Rail-road and stages from Morrisania.

For particulars apply personally, or by letter, addressed to Mr. Isaac Wilkins, West Farms.

Circulars may be obtained at the Churchman office, 12 John street. Feb. 27—tf